52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

Speaker Churchill: "The House will be in order. The House will be order. Before we begin our business today, Representative Flowers has asked for all the women Legislators to gather in front of the podium. Apparently. they need one more picture. The House will be in The House will be in order. Members will be in their chairs. Representative Churchill in the Chair. ₩e out today with a sad note. Early this morning, former Representative Bob Regan passed away. Bob had been very for a brief period of time. Visitation will be Friday from 2:00 to 9:00, and the funeral services will be on Saturday at 10:30 at the Crete Funeral Home, which is 1182 Dixie Highway, Main Street, in Crete, Illinois. Memorials sent to the Robert P. Regan Endowment and be Scholarship Fund, care of Household Bank, 1380 Main Street, Crete, Illinois, 60417. We'll have this information for you, if anybody would like to get that information, we can get it to you at a later time. The Chaplain for the day Reverend David Jankowski of the Grace Baptist Church in Mahomet. Reverend Jankowski is the quest of Representative Rick Winkel. Will the guests in the gallery please rise to join us for the invocation. Reverend Jankowski."

Reverend Jankowski: "Let's pray together. Our Father, who art in Heaven, hallowed be Thy Name. We worship You today because You're the Creator and the Sovereign of the Universe, and we pray that Your Kingdom will come and Your Will will be done, on earth as it is in Heaven. Lord, I pray for this Body, that You will help them to know Your Mind, to represent Your guidelines and principles and precepts so that they might legislate for the betterment of people throughout this state. Give us this day, our daily bread, Lord. We pray for the family of Bob Regan. We pray that

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

Your comfort and peace will be with them. Pray, too, for Representatives here, who are going through difficult times, perhaps with family struggles, marital difficulties, financial troubles. And Lord, I pray that You will minister today, through someone, to these particular needs. Pray, too, Lord, that You will help us to forgive our sins, that You will forgive our sins as we forgive those who sin against us. Give us a charitable spirit here today, Lord. remember that we're all frail. We all make Help us to mistakes and we all fail. Then Lord, we ask that You will deliver us from evil and keep us from making errors of judgement and errors that would hurt others. We pray this Lord, because we know that You are the One who deserves the the Power and the Glory, forever. We pray this in Jesus' loving Name. Amen."

- Speaker Churchill: "We'll be led in the Pledge of Allegiance
 today by Representative Pankau."
- Pankau et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Churchill: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Currie, are there any excused absences on the Democratic side of the aisle?"
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that

 Representative Monique Davis is excused because of

 business. Representative Martinez is still excused

 because of illness."
- Speaker Churchill: "The Journal will so reflect. Representative Cross, are there any excused absences on the Republican side of the aisle?"
- Cross: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, thanks for asking us. It's a pleasure

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

to see you today. Representative Stephens should be shown as excused today in the Journal. Thank you."

- Speaker Churchill: "The Journal will reflect that also. Mr.

 Clerk, take the record. There are 115 Members answering
 the Roll and a quorum is present. The House will come to
 order. Committee reports."
- Clerk McLennand: "Committee reports. Committee report Representative Ackerman, Chairman for Committee on Public Utilities, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken on May 2, 1995, reported the same back with the following recommendations; 'do pass' Senate Bill 'do pass' short debate, Senate Bill 160. Committee report from Representative Wait, Chairman for Committee on Transportation and Motor Vehicles, to which the following Bills were referred. Action taken on May 2, 1997 (sic), reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass short debate, Senate Bill 66. Committee report Representative Cross, Chairman for Committee on Judiciary for Civil Law, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken on May 3, 1995, reported the same back with the following recommendations; 'do pass' Senate Bills 28 and 235, 'do pass' as amended Senate Bill 407. Committee report from Representative Krause, Chairman for Committee on Health Care and Human Services, to which the following were referred, action taken on May 3. reported the same back with the following recommendations; 'do pass' as amended, Senate Bill 293, 'do pass' as amended short debate, Senate Bill 388. Committee report from Representative Balthis, Chairman for Committee on Cities and Villages, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken on May 2, 1995, reported the same back with the following recommendations; 'do pass' short debate,

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

Senate Bill 222, 'do pass' as amended short debate, Senate Bill 75.Committee report from Representative Churchill, Chairman for Committee on Rules, to which the following Resolution was referred, action taken on May 2, 1995, reported the same back with the following recommendation; 'do adopt' House Resolution #43."

Speaker Churchill: "Supplemental Calendar announcement."

Clerk McLennand: "Supplemental Calendar #1 is being distributed."

Speaker Churchill: "Message from the Governor."

Clerk McLennand: "Message from the Governor, pursuant to Article
4, Section 9(b) of the Illinois Constitution of 1970, the
following House Bill has been vetoed and returned by the
Governor, House Bill 496."

Speaker Churchill: "Announcements, Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk McLennand: "Rules Committee notice, the Rules Committee will meet on Wednesday, May 3rd, immediately upon adjournment in the Speaker's Conference Room. Rules Committee, immediately upon adjournment, in the Speaker's Conference Room."
- Speaker Churchill: "We'll now proceed to the Order of Senate Bills Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, Please read Senate Bill 923."
- Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 923, a Bill for an Act to provide supplemental appropriations and legislative transfers for various state agencies for fiscal year '95. Third Reading of the Hous... this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Churchill: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Brunsvold, arise?"
- Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, request a Democratic conference immediately."
- Speaker Churchill: "And for how long will you be gone, Sir?"
 Brunsvold: "Approximately a half hour, 45 minutes."

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

- Speaker Churchill: "The Lady from DuPage, Representative Biggert.

 For what purpose do you rise?"
- Biggert: "The Republicans would also request a conference, in that case, in room 118 immediately."
- Speaker Churchill: "Let's put the Republican's in room 114.

 Let's put the Democrats in room 118 for about a half an hour. The two Parties will go to caucus at this time. And before we go to caucus, will the Ladies please listen. Representative Flowers has asked that all the Ladies to come down in front of the podium for a quick picture, again. So, please Ladies, before we go to caucus, please come down to the podium for your picture. The House will stand in recess until the caucuses have been completed."
- Clerk McLennand: "Introduction, First Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 401, offered by Representative Balthis, a Bill for an Act in relation to property taxation. Senate Bill 585, offered by Speaker Daniels, a Bill for an Act that amends the Attorney General Act. Senate Bill 710, by Representative Lyons, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Senate Bill 1022, offered by Representative Maureen Murphy, a Bill for an Act to amend the Property Tax 1025, offered by Representative Code. Senate Bill Wennlund, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code of Senate Bill 1122, offered by Representative Ryder, a Bill for an Act in relation to education. Senate Bill 1194, offered by Representative John Jones, a Bill for an Act to amend the River Conservancy Districts Act. And Senate Bill 1203, offered by Representative Ryder, a Bill for an Act that amends the Business Corporation Act of 1983. Introduction, First Reading, these Senate Bills."
- Speaker Churchill: "The House will come to order. Committee Reports."

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

- Clerk Rossi: "Representative Clayton, Vice-Chairman for the Committee on Executive, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken on May 3, 1995, reported the same back with the following recommendation; 'do pass' Senate Bills 185, 836, 424, 298, 364, 'do pass' as amended Senate Bill 206, 'do pass' short debate, Senate Bill 313."
- Speaker Churchill: "We'll now proceed to the Order of Senate
 Bills Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read Senate Bill
 923."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 923, a Bill for an Act to provide supplemental appropriations and legislative transfers for various State agencies for fiscal year 1995. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Churchill: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Jersey, Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to present Senate Bill 923, which is the supplemental appropriation to the FY'95 It contains \$210 budget. million in supplemental appropriations to 30 state agencies, boards commissions. Of this amount \$120 million is from General Revenue Funds and they are used for such things as pass through buying on the 1993 flood appropriation... or flood spending authority for federal grants, money to pay old Medicaid bills and funding for the Department of Children and Family Services. In addition, it does contain dollars for the necessary appropriations in certain agencies. It does include money for the appropriation for... executive, legislative and increases for including State's Attorneys. It is a large and significant piece of appropriation legislation. The reason that we are able to... to do this today is that we have received from the Bureau of the Budget, as confirmed by Economic and

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

Fiscal Commission, an additional \$210 million of revenue. This money includes \$48 million more in personal income, \$48 million more in corporate income, \$75 million more sales, \$15 million less in public utilities, \$25 million more in inheritance tax, \$36 more than interest investments were projected. Other funds who are down \$15 million, the lottery is up by \$20 million and because the increased amounts in personal and corporate income, the amount of the refund funds will, of course, be increased by amount of \$3 million and \$9 million and the personal incorporate amounts respectively. Although the Economic and Fiscal is not in exact agreement with the Bureau of the Budget, both estimates are far in excess of the \$120 million of General Revenue Funds that we do appropriate in the Supplemental. Mr. Speaker, I'd be happy to answer any questions on this Bill, and I would move for its adoption." discussion? The

Speaker Churchill: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Macoupin, Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Churchill: "He indicates that he will. Please proceed."

Hannig: "Representative, I didn't hear the explanation of the extra revenue. Did you say that the Bureau had raised a revenue estimates? And could you maybe... elaborate a little bit on when that happened and how much?"

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative Hannig, your question is most astute. The reason that we're able to suggest at this point that there are additional funds coming in, is that when the budget was passed, the one you and I worked on last year, we made a guess as to how much revenue we thought would be available. It appears that our guess was conservative, which is a...

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

probably a good way to run state government and we are now looking at actual revenues. We're looking at actual dollars that have arrived in the bank from these various and a sundry resources and we are now only 60 days away from the end of the fiscal year. So, having looked at the last 10 months, it's much easier to guess how the next two months will proceed. It gives us inc... an increased ability to be able to make that judgment and the... the bottom line is that things are doing better than we anticipated. Corporate tax, income tax, sales tax, the lottery are all doing better than we anticipated. I would not however suggest that the inheritance tax line is one that we can project. We've simply added to that, the \$15 million that has already been collected simply because that is a... an income line that is somewhat difficult to project, so we only take a look at dollars in the bank on that one. If you have other questions on that matter, I'll be happy to answer them, Sir."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes, Representative Ryder, does this thing carry into FY
'96? Has the Bureau also raised the revenue estimates for
FY '96 based on this robust showing for the end of FY '95
and if so, by how much?"

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, I don't believe that the Bureau of the Budget is going to change those figures at this date. Economic and Fiscal, however, have - and you are as aware of the figures from Economic and Fiscal as I am. The... the Bureau of the Budget simply takes a look at money that comes into the bank, that's the reason that we're able to take a look at where we are at this point."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Hannig."

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

Hannig: "Yes. So, but when this Bill was initially introduced or... a Supplemental was introduced in the House earlier and when this Bill was introduced in the Senate, we really were not aware if there would be any additional money. So was the administrations thought at that point, that they would just go forward with this Supplemental. We're just so fortunate that we found that extra money just recently. Is that somewhat what happened, or am I... have I misunderstood this sequence of events?"

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Ryder. One second,
Representative Ryder, Ladies and Gentleman. This is a very
important issue to the people in the State of Illinois.
The people who are debating the issue cannot hear each
other. Would you please be quiet? If you have to have
meetings, please take those meetings to the back of the
chamber. Thank you. Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, the question you asked is important. This supplemental or its ancestors has been moving through the system for several months now. were reluctant to move it for many reasons, one of which is, we wanted to make sure we had the dollars on hand to be able to take care of it. The most important part of this Bill from some areas is the fact that the federal money is available for the pass through concerning the flooding. I've had calls from my district, perhaps others have as well, that the buy out through the emergency management has been possible because those funds have appropriated. This Bill would do that. The amount you're talking about is that we understood that there would be pressures within the budget that needed addressing even when we passed the budget last year, but we fought... thought that it was wise to wait to see how those pressures

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

developed, knowing that late in this fiscal year, we would then find it necessary to make those adjustments. That's what these adjustments are. The figures that we're showing to you are... were considered as part of the Governor's budget for the next fiscal year. We were able to use money in the best possible way to be able to then maximize federal dollars as they pass through. We... we believe that the dollars are present, to be able to spend in this budget, Representative Hanniq."

- Speaker Churchill: "Further discussion, the Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Brunsvold."
- Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to yield my time to Representative Hanniq."
- Speaker Churchill: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Macoupin, Representative Hannig."
- Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just let me then begin talking a little about the actual expenditures. I quess it's fortunate that as we end, or begin the end of our legislative debates here, that we always seem to have the opportunity to find extra money to spend, because we certainly know that we need it. Representative, the payments to medical providers, this proposal would increase the amount of money that we would have available to pay some of those providers, but would also capture a federal match. Our staff, though, informed us that there is a... a problem potentially and that is, that if the state portion of that money is not spent till say, mid June, that we may not capture the federal match until FY'96. How would we... first of all, is that problem in your opinion? Secondly, how would we deal with that?"

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, the... it would

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

be my wish, that if we're successful in passing this Bill today, that the Bill will then go back to the Senate for their concurrence. I have reason to believe that they will concur. Then the Bill goes to the Governor. Should the Governor sign it, I believe that the \$63 million and... in money that this appropriates will be spent just as soon as possible. It's not as if we have to look for somewhere to spend it."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Hannig."

Ryder: "It is specific that we need to spend it on old Bills and that we believe that, that amount could easily be spent... could be spent by simply paying those warrants that are... are waiting to be paid. My calculation is that we're talking about a very short period of time in order to do that, should we receive the cooperation in order to pass the Bill today and the ability of the Senate, which I believe is present, in order to get this job done. Representative, let me be real clear about this, because we always have this problem late in the legislative year, where we're dealing right now. In the... whether we spend this money today, tomorrow or the next day, your... these are bills to be paid. We're offering an opportunity to pay some of those bills. We want to reduce that back log. I know that your statements indicate you wish to do the same thing, so that we believe that we can do that, the quicker the better. And we're offering a plan to pay some of those back bills. I truly wish that I could suggest more money to do that. I truly wish that I could suggest more money to do that. I truly wish that I could provide more funds at this time. I hope between now and the end of the fiscal year that I will be able to suggest that, but I'm offering an opportunity today to try and pay some of those bills and

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

I hope that we can get the job done."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "I appreciate the Gentleman's explanation and I... I hope that you are correct, Representative, and that we don't find ourself not capturing this federal money which is included in this proposal because as you say, there's no question that we need it. It's my understanding that we owe somewhere around \$1.4 billion in Medicaid, maybe depending on whose counting, it could be as high as \$2 billion from the provider side. What's your best estimate as to what we actually owe as of this time?"

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, I believe that the amount is... is a little bit less than the \$1.4 that you indicate. I do not believe it's the \$2 billion that you indicate. I believe that it... my best estimate is about \$1.313 after this Bill, would be approximately \$1.2. So, you have the opportunity today, to pay off about a \$120 million of those bills to reduce by approximately by 1, 1/11th, which I think is a significant opportunity and I would hope that we would be able to have your assistance to do that, Sir."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes, Representative, I think the 63 does include the
Federal match already, is that correct or not?"

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, the figures that I indicated and... are that we owe about 1.313 now after payment of the 63, it goes to about 1.250, so I was rounding off and I'm sorry."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes, I think that this supplemental provides that we
would pay off a total, federal and state, of about \$63
million. So, we owe \$1.3 billion perhaps under your...

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

your best guess. So, under that kind of scenario, how long would it take us to pay this all off? Do you know that?"

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Ryder."

- Ryder: "Representative, I would not suggest that the amount of money that we're offering to pay those bills today is meant to be an annual installment. It is my suggestion that that is a start. I believe that we can... we can reduce by even more amount next year. I would like to see it being reduced by much more than this over the next fourteen months, but in order to do that we have to start today. And I'm suggesting that the \$63 million, which includes federal and state dollars as you correctly assert, is the very best effort that we can do today in order to accomplish that. And it's for that reason that I offer this piece of legislation."
- Speaker Churchill: "Ladies and Gentlemen, before we go on to the next person seeking recognition, let us please recognize the students from Orion Middle School, in Orion, Illinois, who are the band and chorus members who performed in the rotunda today. These are the students in the red shirts in the east and north balcony. Welcome to the Illinois House of Representatives. Further discussion? The Gentleman from Williamson, Representative Woolard. Representative Woolard."
- Woolard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to yield my time to Representative Hanniq, if I may."
- Speaker Churchill: "One other recognition for the DuPage County
 Republican women who are in the Speaker's gallery, welcome,
 today. Representative Hannig."
- Hannig: "Just back to the point on this \$63 million.

 Representative, I think we all see that as a step forward,
 but it's a very minute step forward and we would hope that

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

we could tell our medical providers that we could do better than a 20 year payment cycle for services that they had provided today or yesterday or the day before and certainly... my thoughts would be that while you are making a step forward, I... I wish that we could say that it was a bigger one. Do you know for example, how much the current payment cycle is for Medicaid and... and how much this will reduce it? In other words, what it is now, and what it will be after the supplemental?"

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First, let me correct statement that the Gentleman made on the record. This intended to be an annual payment over 20 years. intent is to con... continue to decrease the amount of back log, it's approximately a 90 day average. Some are more, some are less, but about a 90 day average lag on payment of spending. It is not our intention that we pay \$63 million every year in order to pay it down. It is our intention to pay much more than that in the next year and the year after that. We would like to eliminate it as absolutely as quickly as possible. So, please don't characterize the \$63 million as an annual installment. It is not, it is simply the first step of what I hope to be larger paybacks as soon as possible."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes, well Representative, not to belabor the point. I think the Governor had put about \$65 million in FY'96 budget to pay some of the old Bills. And we see this \$63 million here and certainly those are, as I said, minute steps forward but I think that from our side of the aisle, we would like to see some additional amounts. Last year, I think we put in something like \$687 million to try to make

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

a step forward. Due to some budgetary miscalculations, I think we didn't see nearly that amount of money reduced, but the point is, I think, that it's something of that magnitude would be more appropriate. Now you said that we're looking at about 90 days in the payment cycle roughly now, can you tell us if the supplemental will reduce that significantly from 90 days to... to where?"

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, the supplemental represents about four days of spending."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "I... I, but will it reduce... it will not... You're not saying that it will reduce the payment cycle by four days are you? From 90 to 86, is that what you're saying?"

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, I'm not sure. I'm not going to suggest that it will reduce it. It... it should have a positive affect. What it should accomplish is, that's money that is due in owing that can be paid. I would suggest to you. Sir, that had we had cooperation on your side of the aisle last year, we had a plan to restructure the entire debt but that plan was... was negated on your suggestions and I'm not questioning those. I'm simply saying that there was a plan out there to do that and it was rejected so we are what we can now. I would also add to you, Representative, that the amount that we are suggesting is, I hope to be built in. in addition to the Governor's amount and we hope to add to more than that well, so that we can reduce it by an even more substantial amount during the next fiscal year."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Well again, Representative, I... I know that the

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

Governor had a proposal to borrow a great amount of money last year to pay this debt. I think many of us on our side of the aisle felt that we should simply pay this money out of... as we go from monies that we have available. It is a current operating expense, as opposed to a long term capital expenditure and we had put an extra \$687 million in the budget that your side of the aisle certainly agreed to, but somehow, with the Bureau of the Budget's estimates. those numbers didn't quite reduce the deficit by anything near that magnitude. But, to go on to some of the other items in the budget. Representative, in the original budget that started out in the Senate, DCFS had additional, I believe, \$72 million οf supplemental requests, and now it's down to \$40 million, I believe. And we've had testimony in the Appropriations Committee here in the House, that that could provide... that that could provoke some very detrimental problems for the department. In fact, the agency director even testified to that effect in our Appropriations Committee. And, Representative, we like to have assurances from your side that none of these bad things are going to happen. In fact, could you please, maybe expound on that a little bit?"

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, that... that's an excellent question which will take more than the three seconds that I have..."

Speaker Churchill: "You were right. Before we go on to the next person, the Chair would like to announce that in the Speaker's gallery are members of the Mt. Vernon High School Mock Trial Team. This team won the Mock Trial competition for the State of Illinois and they now advance to the national competition in Colorado. These students are guests of Representative John Jones. Congratulations and

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

good luck in the national competition. Now perhaps, if we could just quiet down a little bit so that we can continue on here. The Chair would like to recognize the Gentleman from Saline, Representative Phelps. Representative Phelps."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to yield my time also to Mr. Hanniq."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes, Representative, just... just let me say that in committee, it's our remarks, was that the director said that first of all, that the agency had not been consulted. That secondly, that he... he talked a little bit about the 3% community, 3.3% community provider rate increase that we had proposed for April 1, that was not being dealt with, that the agency will not analyze a 3.3% and that the agency may have to adjust hiring, that the agency may have to limit services and that the agency, which is now on a 30 day payment cycle will have to expand that payment cycle, in order to deal with this request. So, could you maybe specifically answer some of those points for us, Representative?"

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, let me be specific, as I can, to the answers to those questions. When you and I and others sat down a year ago in order to pound out a budget, we knew that there was a possibility that the case load in the Department of Children and Family Services might increase. As a result, there was an agreement among the parties that an additional \$28 million would be necessary for the Department of Children and Family Services and that we would address that in a supplemental, \$28 million. We put in sufficient money.

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

You and I together, Representative, we put in sufficient money for the Grotberg increase. We put in sufficient money for the other pressures that you just enumerated. The Department of Children and Family Services received the money that was requested. And we agreed that we'd come back and we would address a \$28 million problem that exist, we didn't know, that may exist in the... in the case We have now discovered that that problem does exist and we are addressing it, not with \$28 million, but with all those 50% more of \$40 million in order to address that single problem and every other one of those lines, the ones where you suggest pressure, the ones where you suggested there was to be an increase. Those lines are as fully funded today as they were when the budget was introduced. The problem is that the department has decided to adjust among themselves, in order to cause the most effort to address what they consider to be an effort on our part to keep their spending within bounds. I don't blame department for that. They are doing the very best that they can and a very, very difficult situation. I admire them for that. I think frankly, that their situation is almost impossible given the kinds of dysfunctional families that we have in this nation, given the kinds of problems that we have with families in the state and as a result, I believe, that the department can operate, can fund, can do we've asked them to do with this additional \$40 million. It is almost 50% more than the 28 we agreed to. Is it as much as they asked for? No, it's not. No, it isn't. Is it as much as the Senate agreed to do? Yes, is and hopefully the House agrees to do. But, to the bottom line with this Representative Hannig, and as a CPA, I know that you understand bottom lines better than many of

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

We're looking at the Department of Children and Family Services on a continual basis. And if prove the necessity of these funds to our satisfaction between now and the end of this fiscal year, I believe that their budget for the next fiscal reflect that need. In much the same way as the old bills, they're still there. If the needs are there, they're there and as a result, we have to address that. We're simply saying that at this point, they've convinced us that they need more than the \$28 million that we agreed to. That they need \$40 million, almost 50% more and as a result, we're providing that \$40 million more. certainly not me, I doubt you, is saying to the Department of Children and Family Services, 'We're closing the door in your face; we're not providing anymore money.' What we are saying, Representative Hannig, is that we are dealing with the problem as we see it. We're willing to proceed, we're willing to continue talking just as you have in committees and otherwise, for the continual needs of the department. I believe that the \$40 million plus the increases of last year, plus the base budget in the Department of Children and Family Services will continue to be examined by this... by this Legislature, by your participation in the Appropriations Committees and by mine. And I hope that we can do the very best we can for a very, very difficult issue."

Speaker Churchill: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield my time to Representative Hanniq."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes, I'm only getting about one or two questions in each

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

one of these... yes, maybe I should ask for more distinct answers from my... my colleague over there..."

Speaker Churchill: "I thought you wanted full debate. Sir?"

Hannig: "Well, we certainly are for that, Mr. Speaker. Let me follow up on that, Representative..."

Speaker Churchill: "Excuse me, Representative Hannig.

Representative Ryder."

Hannig: "On my time?"

Ryder: "Representative Hannig, apparently we're doing something wrong because I have some of my Members that want to yield you time and I don't think that's fair, so,... back to you."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Hannig. Representative Hannig, please proceed."

Hannig: "Okay, back to the business at hand. Representative, we're concerned that a number of these children who are under the care of DCFS could be negatively impacted by this supplemental. And it was obviously introduced, it's... at a higher amount, the Governor felt that, that was appropriate amount, \$72 million. I think we have testimony from the director that he needs that money, that we could very well be in a situation where we would not be able to make the June payments for the foster care parents, that some children could be at risk. And it seems that really, we just took this money from one line item, to put it over in Public Aid and pay some of those old bills and that we're just shifting the paying back and forth. And doesn't it seem that maybe a better approach would to be to try to find a comprehensive way to deal with... with these old bills all at once, and have a plan? You know the Secretary of State came out with a plan yesterday. Maybe we don't all endorse that plan, but at least he had a plan and I think

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

maybe, we in the Legislature ought to be sitting down and talking about finding a plan to pay off some of these old bills and not shifting this paying back and forth and back and forth, and it... the question specifically, are we not putting foster parents and children at risk with this supplemental?"

Speaker Churchill: "Congratulations, Representative Hannig, that
was a minute and a half question, very good. For the other
half of this show, Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative Hannig, I am certain that those folks that are listening in the Secretary of State's office on second floor will want to sign you up to be one of the Sponsor's of his plan, since you are so articulate in support of that issue, and as a result, I'd... I would expect that very soon they'll be contacting you to sponsor extra riverboats because οf your Representative, we've offered a plan. The Governor offered a plan a year ago to comprehensively deal with that, you rejected it. We are now dealing with the balancing, very tough business of operating a state budget. I know that when you ask these questions that you know many of the answers because you know the appropriation process. But let me be very specific here. Let me try to address your question as straight forward as I can. Ιt is my humble belief that offering an additional \$40 million to the Department of Children and Family Services doesn't threaten children, Doesn't harm children, Doesn't harm families, but rather it offers \$40 million more to take care of families and children that are in dysfunctional situations, that find themselves hurt or abused. I have a choice, \$40 million, that's what I believe is helpful to the Department of Children and Family Services. Is this going to answer

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

all of their questions, no. Is this going to supply all of their wants, no. I'm not sure that neither you or I have sufficient funds to be able to answer all of those questions today or that we could spend all of the money necessary to satisfy all of those folks who will have needs and wants from state government. So, what we're left to is the very difficult job in state government of sometimes saying 'no', of sometimes saying 'no' to ideas and sometimes saying to departments, here's an amount of money, use it in the best way possible to be good stewards of those funds. We don't have unlimited funds in We don't have unlimited dollars to address this state. these problems. And, in fact, if we did, unlimited dollars are not the answer... the sole answer to the social woes that we are trying to cure with the Department of Children and Family Services, the Department of Aging, the Department of Public Aid. What we are trying to do however, is do the best job of balancing that we can. best job that we can to answer those questions and I believe that this budget does make that balance. It tries to pay old bills for the Department of Public Aid. It tries to deal with the fact that we have more clients than we thought in the Department of Aging and providing community care workers. It tries to deal with the Department of Children and Family Services in a way that I is rational, in a way that I believe appropriate. Representative Hannig, I would bet that you and I had the opportunity to sit down and write our own budget, you and I would do a much different job than what we are doing today, but we have a lot of people that we represent and we're doing it with the best of our ability." Speaker Churchill: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook,

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

Representative Murphy."

Murphy, H: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield my time to Representative Hannig."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Again, Representative, the borrowing plan that the Governor put on the table last year was not one that I think that people on this side of the aisle subscribe to. We got in the situation of owing all this money simply because we spent more than we had. And we're going to have to make some hard decisions in an effort to bring our House in order and I think... Members on this side of the aisle certainly feel that we have to make those hard choices and we're willing to try to work with you on it, but I don't think borrowing money is a way to get out of this debt. That's not the way that we got into it, and that's not the way that we should get out of it. But let me ask you, Representative, some of the child welfare service providers have indicated to us in hearings and in testimony that they think that this...that this supplemental will cause problems and that it will make them...it will put them in a situation where they will be turning away kids in June. Can you tell us that that will not happen? Yes or no?"

Speaker Churchill: "Representative... Representative Hannig, are you done with the question? Then we'll go to Representative Ryder for the answer."

Hannig: "I tried to make it a 'yes' or 'no' question."

Speaker Churchill: "Let's see if it worked. Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, I do not believe that this \$40 million extra on top of the Department of Children and Family Services budget is going to cause additional problems. I

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

do believe that if we don't appropriate the \$40 million, it will cause problems so that I have a 'yes' or 'no' proposition which is to say, do we appropriate the \$40 million, or do we not? We could have used the extra \$40 million on paying...paying a back bill for the Department of Public Aid. I chose...we chose what I think is the best reasonable alternative to try to use some of it to help children. I believe that an additional \$40 million will decrease any problems that currently exist, but I'm...I'm happy to tell you that I don't believe that it's going to solve all the problems."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Hannig, that didn't work. Do
 you want to try again?"

Hannig: "Yes, Representative, just...just to the Bill. I think that we're starting to see what's in the Bill. Most of the Members, probably on both sides of the aisle, have at least some idea about what's in this Bill and I hope that debate has helped enlighten them as to some of the problems that we see. I would say, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that in Edgar's first year, the Governor promised us that he would tear up the credit cards, but now that we're in his fifth year, and even as we have record high revenues and even just recently see revenue estimates being raised, we still owe \$1.2 or \$1.3 or maybe \$2 billion to doctors and hospitals and pharmacies and nursing homes. has no plan to pay this debt, no plan to realistically pay this debt in anything less than about a 20 year time frame. Our state credit rating has been down graded three times in the last five year...years. And our Governor's solution to the problem, again, is more of the same, borrow and spend, borrow and spend. You know the Governor wanted authority from Washington to run

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

Managed Care Program. A program that he has told us will save money, but I think that after his \$5 million fiasco with the Healthy Moms and Healthy Kids no bid contract, that he may never get that waiver. Now, we all know the state faces the financial crisis, and I suspect that most of us agree that we need a new budget direction, this supplemental is not a new direction, it is more of the same old thing. Voting for this supplemental is to repeat the many mistakes of the past. The back log of unpaid bills has now become so bad for the health care providers that it's spilling over to our other state agencies. seeing money taken from DCFS as request to pay some of the old bills for the medical providers, and really, we're just robbing 'Peter to pay Paul'. The state is broke, but now in our first vote on any budget this term, we are asked to prove...approve pay raises for Legislators, pay raises for judges and pay raises for State's Attorneys. The state is broke, but our Comptroller puts a half a million dollars as a down payment for a new multi-million dollar computer. The state is broke but constitutional officers transitional money. In this Bill, new Members will have a chance for the first time to clearly state their position on pay raises. If you new Members favor pay raises for Legislators, judges and State's Attorneys, then vote 'yes'. If you oppose these pay raises, vote 'no'. If you vote for this today, you're sending a clear...a clear message that you support the status quo, and if you vote for the status quo supplemental today, be prepared to vote for more borrowing tomorrow. Be prepared to repeal the Prompt Payment Act that we passed last year. Be prepared to vote for a new hospital assessment tax. Be prepared to vote for more bonding. A 'yes' vote is a vote for more borrowing

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

and more deficit budgets. A 'no' vote is a clear message to the Governor that we demand a new direction."

Speaker Churchill: "Further discussion? The Lady from Cook,
Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. I rise opposition to the passage of Senate Bill 923. The Sponsor tells us we don't have unlimited funds to spend. never guess that if you look at the history of this supplemental funding request. November, Back in the Governor's office thought they needed about \$4 million in additional General Revenue Funds. By January, that number had increased to \$10 million. By March, it was \$83 million and look, look at what Senate Bill 923 would commit us to spending today. One hundred and twenty million dollars in General Revenue Funds, well above the Governor's initial estimates. I think the evidence is clear that this is a state in which it's not possible for the administration to manage our finances in an equitable, responsible and fiscally prudent fashion. Let's look at the substance of Senate Bill 923. Yes, there is an effort finally, to begin paying off some of the old Medicaid debt, but you do it by robbing the children who are under the care of the State's Department of Children and Family Services. There will be difficulties in the administration of that department, are told by its director, if we do not honor the full request for \$72 million. Here we're spending only which means that raises for the people who provide foster care and adoption services to our troubled youth, will not get the 3.3% increase we promised them to begin on April 1st. There will be cuts in the administration of the agency, cuts that mean more children will be at risk of abuse and neglect. What are we spending our money on?

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

Well, there's \$150,000 for transitional expenses in the State Treasurer's office. Is that so, so the Treasurer can pay the bills of those two high priced political relations flacks she hired after she got elected? Five hundred thousand dollars for a computer system in the Comptroller's Office. That may be a good idea, but is it a good idea afford today? This budget is about that can mismanagement, it's about not knowing what our resources are, and it's about... it's about badly placed, badly used priorities. The priorities are p.r. flacks, the priority is computers, the priority ought to be children and it ought to be putting our house in good fiscal order. vote for this supplemental appropriation is to turn fiscal prudence on its head. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Churchill: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House.
Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Churchill: "He indicates he will, please proceed."

Hartke: "Representative Ryder, I was around here last year when we passed the budget and it seemed to me that we authorized somewhere about \$33.4 billion worth of spending. Is that correct?"

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Yes."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Do we in the State of Illinois, work on the premise of a balanced budget?"

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Yes."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "In my limited knowledge of accounting, it is my opinion

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

that we authorize...in the State of Illinois, we try to authorize the exact number of dollars that we estimate that we're going to break in... bring in, in the next fiscal year. We... Is that correct?"

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, to say that we try to do it exactly is certainly our intention, but in that amount of money when the sources are, I won't say they unpredictable, but it's difficult to say exactly. But clearly, what we try to do, is to limit expenditures to the amount of revenue that comes in."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "I understand that and so if ... if I try to do that in my budget, I know it's difficult to estimate my yield and what I'm going to get and so forth, so it doesn't always work out; however, in State Government we try to get within a... a percentage of a percent accuracy, When I look at our state budget, and we're about \$1.3 billion or one thousand, three hundred million, depending on how you look at it, short of making our current bills and paying our providers. it would seem to me that we have in the past authorized more spending than we have dollars coming in. And so, to, within a... the last month while we're in Session and two months before we are to take over a new budget in the the 96th budget, here we are trying to authorize more spending, we have all kinds of bills that are laying there because of lack of funds and I hear you say, well we... we're getting more dollars in, that means that we should be able to pay down those dollars because the question arises in my mind, are we short of a authorization or are we short of dollars to pay our bills?"

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Ryder."

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

Ryder: "Representative Hartke, when you plant your spring, when you farm the crop, you know what your cost of putting your crop in. You don't predict what the rain will Some cases you don't know what the federal crop program will be. You don't know what the price will be at the end of the year. So, to suggest that you try to make it work, I'm sure you do. The state tries to do it's work, too. In this situation, Sir, what has occurred is that, when children come to the State of Illinois, we don't the chance to shut our door on them. We take care of them. We don't... we are not able to always predict what families are going to break up, what people are going to lose their jobs and require public assistance. We don't know which child that is on public aid is going to be required to be in a hospital for two weeks. We don't know those Some cases we're accurate; some cases we're not. In this situation, we're talking about approximately 1/2 of deviation. In this case, Sir, we were fortunate, because we're actually receiving more funds this year than we anticipated. We're receiving more income tax dollars, more corporate income tax dollars, more inheritance tax dollars, more sales tax dollars, more lottery proceeds. We're receiving more dollars and it's only because we're receiving more dollars, that we have the opportunity to spend more dollars than we had appropriated. Now, we have problem in this state. We have asked the Federal Government for a Medicaid waiver and it... to this date has not been supplied. So, on the same way that you can't always predict what the federal crop program's going to be, or what they're going to pay, or what the support price is per bushel of corn, we could not predict when the Federal Government is going to give us that waiver. I hope that

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

they will soon, because when they do, we'll be... have a better ability to be able to know what we can spend our dollars on and have a better predictability. But I would suggest that 99.6 is probably enough to get an A grade for my son in school and it's pretty close for operations within the State Government."

Speaker Churchill: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schoenberg."

Schoenberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the The previous speaker alluded to the all miraculous House. Medicaid waiver which... which one would think was coming from a higher being, that's certainly much higher than the administration in Washington. But I think it's fair Membership know that the reason why this miraculous waiver has not taken place yet, is because... we have because the state has been too impetuous, tried to sign up too many people too fast without notifying them enough, providing them with enough information, without making sure that the system was in place so that this program... so that medicaid managed care... MediPlan Plus would not indeed be a self-fulfilling failure. We certainly do wish to rectify the past mistakes which have been made. that's why I'm sure... with many of you I took great interest in the letter which Representative Tom Johnson circulated amongst the Membership on his side of the aisle requesting three things. Three principal things towards ameliorating this problem in the future. One was that we make a meaningful dent into the state's \$1.3 billion accumulated debt. This fails to do that. That we phase out the Medicaid provider tax that the administration's looking for. A lot of us aren't terribly enthusiastic about that. This remains...a gaping...a gaping question

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

with no answer on the horizon. And thirdly, and perhaps most importantly, I want to commend Mr. Johnson for pointing out that we need to take a systematic approach, so that we avert this problem in the future. The arguments which have been made on the other side, have certainly sounded noble at times, but in reality, it's just aside pebbles off the state's mountain of debt. Johnson is absolutely correct and 35 Members on this...on the other side of the aisle signed that letter. We need to revise the process by which we do this. We need to take a systemic approach towards running up a debt which we in fact can't cover, and I'd like to join Mr. Johnson in those sentiments because I think that he speaks...I think he speaks to a feeling that many of the Members...who our newer Members have about how things have been done in the past and every... and we've heard in the debate how signed off on what the other side has done, but Mr. Johnson's was excel... absolutely correct in letter, that we need to take a systematic approach in reducing the state's accumulated debt. I'm only hopeful, my friends, I'm only hopeful that block grants do not come from Washington to the State of Illinois because the current federal block grant proposals that are on the table provide 25% discretion. A 25% threshold to skim that money and apply it towards other budgetary needs. I can only imagine what we'd be doing to children's lunches, to other family services and other human services which essential services that would go un...those needs which would go unmet because we would...the very same Federal Government, who sometimes we've conveniently...bash on and wack at for acting in a responsible manner when it comes to the...our state's Medicaid program. If they were to

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

provide us with block grants, I think we all know that, that money would be skimmed off the top, that 25% would indeed be skimmed away and applied to fill other holes and indeed Mr. Johnson...and the rest of us who'd like to see some meaningful budget reform and deficit reduction would not do anything more than see a perpetuation of our current practices. I rise to respectively request you all to vote against Senate Bill 923."

Speaker Churchill: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Tom Johnson."

Johnson, Tom: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Having heard my name used many times in that past debate, I would just rise in strong support of this supplemental because I think it is a step in precisely the direction of which all of us were talking about and it's a small step, but it is a beginning step. As we are all aware, this is a supplemental budget. This is not the upcoming budget, but even in this budget there is a major movement to recognize and deal with existing debt. I think that this budget or this supplemental appropriations does all and more to get things moving in the right direction. I welcome the other side in terms of its comments and I think it's something that we all need to continue to focus on. This is not an easy process for any of us, but it's one that we all have to focus on and hopefully, we will be joined by the other side in terms of gel...dealing with some of those systemic issues that confront the state. So again, Mr. Speaker, thank you for letting me speak."

Speaker Churchill: "Further discussion? The Lady from Cook, Representative Schakowsky."

Schakowsky: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Churchill: "He indicates that he will, please proceed."

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

Schakowsky: "Representative, in this budget, in this supplemental budget, how much of it goes for salary increases?"

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Ryder. Perhaps the people who are standing in the aisles could move so that Representative Ryder can see Representative Schakowsky and they can further this debate. Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I can see the Representative and I'm trying to get this...of the amount \$302,110 thousand of which \$295,400 is GRF, is for the salary increase for the state officers and the executive and legislative branches as recommended by the Compensation Review Board and as voted against by most of the Members of this House. There is an additional supplemental amount of 3.2 million for judicial salary increases and the State Attorney's salary increase is...just a minute I'll have it. It is 1.35 million GRF."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Schakowsky."

Schakowsky: "So, there's about, as I understand it, about \$5.1 million dollars in pay hikes in this legislation. How much of it directly goes for pay hikes for Members of the General Assembly?"

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "\$302,100, Ma'am."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Schakowsky."

Schakowsky: "As you pointed out, Representative, while most of us voted against it, you're asking all of us now to say, 'well forget that, now it's time to vote the real dollars'. This is the real vote in my view and so, you're asking us to authorize the spending of the money for the pay hikes."

Speaker Churchill: "Was that a question, Representative Schakowsky?"

Schakowsky: "No, actually it wasn't. I do have another question,

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

though. In the State Treasurer's Office, I see that there is a \$150,000 in GRF for transitional expenses. What's that?"

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Ryder."

"Representative, when the State Treasurer that was elected Rvder: and inaugurated in January, took over the office, that Treasurer discovered that the previous occupant of office had expended funds in such a fashion that it was impossible to operate the office; which is to say that more than 50% was spent in the first half of the year. result, the Treasurer reduced the numbers within that office. The Treasurer attempted to bring the budget within to line. There were some transitional expenses which are expenses that are normal and customary when an office changes hands, whether between parties or between individuals, that would assist the new person coming into that office. There are clearly some expenses that appropriate for that situation and there are clearly some expenses that would come within this. Those expenses have to be within line as approved under the guidelines of the State of Illinois in order for the Comptroller to approve those expenses and for them to be paid. I believe that those are the expenses that would be covered by There was however, an allegation in your previous comment that I do wish to address. The Members of this almost totally, perhaps not unanimously, but almost totally indicated that they were not in favor of raises recommended by the Compensation Review Committee. As a result, we are now faced with the unpleasant task of saying, do we operate by the state law or do we not. If you, Representative, wish not to take the raise to which you are entitled under the law, the raise by the way, that

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

you have been receiving since first day of January, excuse me, since the 11th when you were inaugurated, if you decide not to take those funds, that's your personal decision. However, we do have to operate by the law. Law indicates that all Representatives are entitled to those funds and as a result, we have to follow the law. Now, I suppose if we didn't fund it, we would be subject to the criticism by the other side, who has the luxury of saying, 'we're not going to help you solve the solution...or solve the problem but we're not going to be part of the solution either. **YOU** can't have it both ways. You either have to do your very best in State Government or not. This is not a vote on pay raise, no amount of conversation, press releases or otherwise on your side can accomplish that. What it is, is meeting the laws of the State of Illinois. The vote on the pay raise was the one concerning the Compensation Review Board. Many of the Members on your side of the aisle said, they reject it. But, for us to now say that you are worth more than someone else who doesn't wish the money, I believe that we're all State Representatives and that we're all entitled to what it is under the law."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Schakowsky."

Schakowsky: "Representative, I asked two very short questions in my five minutes. I'd appreciate being able to finish."

Speaker Churchill: "Perhaps, your seatmate could grant some time to you. The Chair would recognize Representative Dart.

The Chair would recognize the Lady from Cook, Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield my time to Representative Jan Schakowsky."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Schakowsky."

Schakowsky: "Thank you, Speaker. I will in closing want to get

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

back to the pay raise, but I was asking about the State Treasurers Office and the additional transitional expenses, which I understand were not part of the State Treasurer's request four years ago. But, what I'm interested in are a couple of things, one is, is any of this money going to two new press people who are getting paid \$65,000 each or...or another \$135,000 in expenses in the press office for the State Treasurer's Office. Are any of those dollars going for that?"

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, I think you criticized me for perhaps giving too long an answer to your previous questions. So, allow me to answer that question with a very simple, emphatic and absolute, no."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Schakowsky."

Schakowsky: "Representative, some of us in looking over this...supplemental budget, feel particularly offended by this...\$150,000 increase for the State Treasurer's Office, particularly in light of the fact that we have been bilked out of about \$20 million that she has...a rather bad deal it seems to many of us, that she has made worth about \$20 million. I'm wondering if there's been any consideration that the \$150,000, perhaps might be donated by a Mr. Cellini or somebody else who has benefited by the largess of the State's Treasurer's Office."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Obviously, short answers are not going to be sufficient. So, I'm going to take the time to answer that one very directly. Representative, in order to understand the situation, perhaps we ought to take a look at what the past Treasurer accomplished, or the past Treasurers accomplished, when they allowed junior liens to

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

take precedence over the state, when they allowed the bills to which you addressed yourselves, to remain on the books fashion of which they did. To now suggest in some fashion that the transition from a person dually elected to a constitutional office is in is in anyway, I believe, Representative, is totally connected, absolutely wrong. However, you're entitled to your opinion on those loans. I have my opinion as well. They are part of this Bill. They are not part of the supplemental. I would assume that you will continue to maintain those positions. I would assume however, that your position and your future votes will be the same just like your past votes have been when the Treasurers Office's budget has continually been before us and you have been absolutely silent on this issue. Reasonable people may disagree as to what should and should not have taken place and perhaps, the sentiments that you describe might even be shared by colleagues on both sides of the aisle. I don't know. I do know is that we have the Office of the Treasurer that had a transition. I do have some knowledge of situation that the current occupant of that office found once that occupant took over. I do have some knowledge of the business decisions that, that occupant took once that person took over that office. As a result, I believe that the transition funds in this situation are appropriate. that they are commensurate with what took place now, what has taken place in the past, and probably what will take place in the future. I would anticipate that to be the case. However, I do not believe it appropriate for you to suggest at this point, when the issue is clearly not before us, that in some way, that we're to be casting judgement based on that. This is not the place.

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

not the forum. Representative, I would give a good effort for...or a good grade for effort, but I would suggest to you that any suggestion, and I particularly resent the fact that you chose to raise on the Floor of the House, the name of an individual that's not here. You know that your words are protected on the Floor of the House. You know that. You are an intelligent and experienced Legislator and as a result, you know that anything that you might say on the Floor is completely without recourse by any other individual. Especially those that aren't here. So, as a result, what you've done, Representative, by bringing this issue into the debate when it's not here, it's not present. You know that and I know that. But I will give you a good grade for a good effort at trying to confuse us when we're trying to take care of abused children and..."

Speaker Churchill: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dart."

Dart: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This...Let's be clear about what this...this supplemental does. It says for starters rather loud and clear, that we don't keep our promises. It say's secondly, that our children are not a priority in this state. It say's it loud and clear. I hope that none of you have foster parents in your district. I hope none of you have foster children or DCFS wards or adoptive parents, because they're going to be outraged with this, outraged. This money is not money that is \$40 million increase, this is \$30 million of broken promises. Something we've gotten to be real good at. Let me just give you an idea of what this is going to do. What this is going to do, by turning your backs on the children and the foster parents, you're going to cut off foster parent payment...the payments to the foster parents. The month of

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

June will be highly doubtful whether they'll see this. These are the people that we have made promises to. Promise after promise that they were going to get We're talking about \$10 a day which some of these people will get, which is all they have for children that we dump on them. So, with us yet again breaking our word to them, what is the message we're sending out to the foster parents who take care of our mess? We're sending a message out to them loud and clear that we are not people of our word and we will not compensate you, we will not take care of you. So. what will that do? Well, it doesn't take an 'Einstein' to figure that out, folks. What that's going to mean, there's going to be less and less foster parents. The only people we have right now that keeps this disaster of DCFS up on its feet are going to be leaving because (a) we won't pay some of them at all and the ones we do pay, we're going to be short changing them like usual. So. that's The second proportion of this one, you ought to be real clear on too, is in regards to adoption subsidies. What's going to occur with us cutting back on adoption subsidies? Well, what that means, is we're going to have less money for the services that help get kids out of the system. You know how we all sit here and moan and complain about DCFS and how they have all these kids in the system. They never seem to leave the system. Well, guess what, one of the only ways out is through adoption and the only do that is through these services that we so provide. And guess what, we aren't going to do that. So when we have more and more kids in the system, don't be surprised. We had the opportunity to do it and we're turning our on that again. So let's not complain about that and

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

complain about all these kids in there, because we had the chance to take care of it, and we're not doing it here. This is something that speaks...it speaks a lot for what we think about our kids and about the system. It gonna cause further problems with the consent to create that the federal courts have on it, the department that runs that department now. will be breaking yet another promise We there as well. All of the agencies, when they came front of us in Appropriation Committee recently, said that with the result of these cuts that you're proposing in this supplemental mean, is they're going to have to services. They're going to have to cut back further at the time that we have more and more cases coming into the svstem. The Sponsor mentioned that this was needed for this department, based on the fact they undercounted their Well, of course, they always do that. cases. They did it even despite the questions we asked them. undercounted their kids like usual and now we're left holding the bag. And so, what are we going do in regards to that? We 're going to cut the money off. So what are going to have? We're going to have more kids languishing in the system and nobody's going to be As I said, I... I'm happy to hear that the people on the other side of the aisle do not have DCFS wards or have no foster parents in their areas, districts, because that way you can feel free voting because don't you have to worry about the repercussions. But for those that might have a couple foster parents or a couple of agencies in your area, you ought to be aware that they're absolutely outraged with And they're going to be letting you know about it. this. So, go ahead and vote for this, but I'm just happy for your

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

sake, that you have none of these people in your districts."

Speaker Black: "Representative Black in the Chair. Purpose of further discussion, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Black: "He indicates he will."

Lang: "Representative, last year, near the end of Session, the Governor found some magic money to fill in some these holes. Are we going to see a repeat of the magic money performance of last year?"

Speaker Black: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, I hope we do have extra money somewhere, that we don't have counted on. I hope we do have a better economy. I hope that we have the opportunity to have people employed, people earning money, paying income taxes, sales taxes. I hope those things happen. I am delighted that we're able to indicate that we have additional money in the bank today, that we didn't have as a result of our guess as a year ago, and I hope that, that continues. To say it's magic money is certainly a pejorative way of describing a good economy. No, I would never accuse you, Sir, of being pejorative in any way at all, but I would indicate that I hope that, that does occur. I don't have anyway of knowing it. At this point, no one has certainly found a safety deposit box. Perhaps, you might suggest us where to look. But the fact of the matter is, we do have to deal with the...with the economies that we have and the appropriations that are there."

Speaker Black: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you. We have a bond rating in this state that's gone down three times in three years because of increasing

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

state debt that we're not doing anything about. Does this supplemental do anything about the problem of our state debt?"

Speaker Black: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, it certainly does something about the unpaid bills, if that's the debt to which you mean. I would suggest to you, Sir, that two companies...that one company reduced it twice, one company reduced it three times. So, I clearly can't argue with what it is that you say. But I would also suggest to you, Sir, that the amount of unpaid bills reflects on those ratings and if you would join me, Sir, in attempting to do something about our unpaid bills, I believe that, that would have a very positive affect on what it is that we do within State Government. There is...there is an amount of state money, when matched with federal money, that would reduce by about \$63 million. The unpaid debt of the State of Illinois."

Speaker Black: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Well, it seems to me that \$63 million on a debt of \$1,300 million is not very much to put in as an installment. At the rate you're going, it will take you some 20 years to pay off that debt. Let me ask you this, are you not getting the money from DCFS to do this? Isn't that really the bottom line of taking a look at this supplemental? You're cutting DCFS's request by \$30 million or so, with the federal match, that's about \$63 million. So, aren't you really cutting DCFS to pay back these providers, even at this slim rate?"

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Churchill in the Chair.

Representative Ryder for the answer."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, I'm afraid to answer that question. I'll be repeating myself from the

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

beginning, but I'll trudge on and see if I can do that, The fact of the matter is, that we're providing \$40 million more for the Department of Children and Family Services than we had appropriated for this fiscal year, 40 million more. We knew that there was a potential of a caseload increase in the beginning of the year that would cause us to have to expand it an additional 28 million. knew that there was a \$28 million pressure. We acknowledged that in the beginning. Both sides of the aisle acknowledged that and yet we passed out the We are now providing for almost 50% more than that 28 million, almost 50% more. We're providing \$40 million able to address the problems of the Department of Children and Family Services. Sir, in answer to the second part of your question which is to say, does the dollars that we spend in one area mean that we're not spending them the other? That's correct. We are, because we're not able to print money. We're not able to do what the Federal Government does. We only can spend the dollars receive in revenues. That's the only dollars that we have to spend. The problem in the appropriation process is, very rarely does somebody come to you and say, Representative, I want you to spend this money on a bad The tough job in appropriations is saying no to good idea. ideas. There are always more ideas than there are money. There are always places to spend more money than we The tough job, the tough job, in appropriations is trying to say, where do we spend the money today? And I'm that we spent \$40 million to try to take care of the pressures within the Department of Children and Family Services, the abused and neglected children, \$40 million." Speaker Churchill: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Rock

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

Island, Representative Boland."

Boland: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in strong opposition to this Bill. Our state is literally swimming in debt. Everybody knows that the State Government of Illinois the biggest deadbeat parent of all. We pass Bills dealing with deadbeat parents and yet, we ourselves are over billion in Medicaid debt. There's been many comments on Secretary Ryan's plan. Now, I'm not of the same Political Party as Mr. Ryan, but I give him credit. He's at least got a plan that will get us out of debt in four years. This plan will keep us in debt for 20 years! Besides that. this is a virtual bandaid on our debt problem that's literally hemorrhaging our state. It's eating up interest should be going to education, that should be going to law enforcement. Besides that, its priorities are out of wack. Let's look at this. The Governor has asked some for 73 million dollars for DCFS. This only appropriates \$40 million for it. The DCFS agency will have to adjust its hiring. It will have less caseworkers to deal with these serious problems. The agency now pays its providers in 30 days. It will be forced to delay payments without full funding of what they want, their \$73 million; the director said this. The director said that the agency have to limit services to deal with a reduced supplemental as provided here. Also, the priorities are way out of wack. Ladies and Gentlemen, how on earth can we ask for pay raises for all of the political figures, when we don't have enough to provide for the children that it? Let's desperately need look at the 500 and some...650,000 for the Comptroller's office. One hundred and fifty thousand for transitional expenses. Did Dawn Clark Neitch get transitional expenses? No. Did Roland

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

Burris get transitional expenses? No. We have another 150,000 for transitional expenses for the State Treasurer. Did Pat Quinn get transitional expenses? No. We have a \$500,000 new computer system for the State Comptroller. That's nice, we'd all like to have new computers for the whole State Government. We can't afford it, Ladies and Gentlemen. Last, let's look at the 102,000 for the law case, Illinois vs. Kentucky. Our Governor never asked for this money and why should we? So, I conclude, Ladies and Gentlemen, I would urge a strong 'no' vote on this Bill."

- Speaker Churchill: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Clinton, Representative Granberg."
- Speaker Churchill: "He indicates that he will. Please proceed."

 Granberg: "Representative Ryder, I just want to make sure I understand this correctly. You indicated there was additional in the bank today, as opposed to last year, so

we could do this supplemental appropriation. Do you know what the GRF balance was in the State Treasury a year ago?"

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "If I'm understanding correctly, you're asking me on May the 2nd, 1994, if I knew what the balance in the State Treasurer was? And my answer to that is, no I don't."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Representative Ryder, I have a letter here from the Comptroller's Office, dated May 9th, 1994, that shows the balance of the state's checkbook at \$246 million. Two hundred forty-six million dollars a year ago today. Do you know what the state's checkbook balance is today, Representative?"

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Ryder."

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

Ryder: "No, Representative, but I just have this hunch. It's a hunch, but I have a hunch that you might be about to educate me as to that."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "It's not often I have the opportunity to do this, but a year ago, we had \$250 million in the state's checkbook.

April 24th, we had 85 million, \$85 million. Do you know how much money we're appropriating in this supplemental in general revenue funds today?"

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Yes, Representative, I do. And in answer to that question, let me suggest to you that in order to take look at a bank balance on any particular day, might be like you and I taking a look at our checkbook. Does that indicate how many bills there are to be paid? Does indicate to you what bills have been paid? Was that the day after we received our paycheck? Was that the before or was it the day after we made our house payment? To compare one day with another, I suggest to you, probably not an accurate way of indicating whether we have the funds available. What I indicated in my earlier comment, what you're asking me to do now, is to suggest how much money are we bringing in? And I'm suggesting to you, that if you take a look at the amount of revenues we've had, Representative, that the amount of revenues that we're bringing in included more money for income tax from individuals and income tax from corporations income...sales tax. All of those are in excess of our estimated revenues for this fiscal year to date. doesn't show on a checking account book on any particular day because of the abilities to pay or to deduct those But I should be talking to Representative, the payments.

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

other Representative that was a CPA rather than the Representative that's an attorney. You'd never have to worry about the balance in your checkbook, I realize that."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Thank you, Representative Ryder. I just want the people on that side of the aisle to understand, we have an \$80 million checkbook balance. Today, by voting 'yes' on this Bill, you are bouncing a check to the tune of million. You are now going to appropriate \$120 million with your 'yes' vote. You only have \$80 million in the checkbook. Last year we had \$240 million. This is ongoing fiscal charade. There is no money. What you're doing today is clearly contrary to common sense. ridiculous. You owe \$2 billion to providers. You're going to bounce a check for \$40 million today to pay bills you don't have any money for to pay. It's a joke. We're fiscal quicksand and the only person who has taken any initiative or any leadership is the Secretary of State, who makes license plates. This is joke, you know it's a joke. We have not come into border. Our bond rate is going down. The state is in a fiscal mess. It's absurd and now you're going to make it even worse by your vote today. This whole thing is a joke, Ladies and Gentlemen, and you think can pull this off with the people of this state? They are going to know. You can't do this. You can't pay bills with money you don't have and then ask to borrow more. federal government is trying to do just the opposite. And here we sit here playing this hoax on the people. I'm going to be a party to it. This side of the aisle is not going to be a party to it. This is your new Republican Majority bouncing more checks and that is the legacy you're going to leave in your time as a Member of this House."

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

Speaker Churchill: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Wojcik."

Wojcik: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Churchill: "The question is, 'Shall the previous question be moved?' All those in favor, signify by saying 'aye'; any opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. And the previous question is moved.

Representative Lang, for what purpose do you arise?"

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on a Point of Order."

Speaker Churchill: "State your point."

Lang: "Thank you. Twenty-Five ILCS, Act 80, the Balanced Budget Note Act, requires that a balance budget note be filed before voting on any budget matter. In this case, would be voting on a budget as amended and I make inquiry as to whether the requirements of the Balanced Budget Note Act have been complied with."

Speaker Churchill: "We will take a pause and we'll get right back to you. Representative Lang, perhaps if you could just restate the sight on your quote."

Lang: "I would be more than happy to, Sir. It's 25 ILCS 80, it's on page 1164 of Volume I of the Illinois Compiled Statutes."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that under the Note Acts, the ones to which the Representative from Cook County is suggesting, that the law indicates that when the Bill is on Second Reading, that those notes may be requested and that a response is required in order to move the Bill from Second to Third. This Bill is on Third Reading, Mr. Speaker, and as a result, the argument of the Gentleman from Cook does not apply."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Lang."

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

- Lang: "Well, for the Chair's reference, Sir, there is no mention in the Balanced Budget Note Act regarding Second Reading. It just simply... it just simply says that we cannot proceed and that the note shall be prepared. Mr. Ryder could not even make a Motion to hold the Act... the Note Act inapplicable because this Section of the statute does not allow for such a Motion as other Sections do. So the statute is very clear, it requires that this fiscal note, this Balanced Budget Note, be filed before we vote on this, Sir."
- Speaker Churchill: "We'll get right back to you. Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I know that you're feverishly reading the statutes but there's no game show that I've ever watched where you get more than 30 seconds to provide the answer. I don't know how long we're going to go on here but I hope that when you do, you'll do it in the form of a question, Sir."
- Speaker Churchill: "First of all, this isn't a game show, we are taking your request seriously and we're trying to find...we believe we have the answer and we're just double checking to make sure that we're correct. Representative Lang, after reviewing your question with the Parliamentarian, it is the opinion of the Chair that, that request should have been done after the Bill was on Second Reading, before it goes to Third Reading and that your request is untimely. Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Mr. Speaker, in the Fiscal Note Act, it says very clearly Second Reading. It does not say that in the Balanced Budget Note Act, in fact, the Balanced Budget Note Act deals specifically with supplemental budgets. It does not say Second Reading as the Fiscal Note Act does, Sir. Now,

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

it would be a simple matter for you to follow the law and provide this tomorrow and pass your supplemental appropriation, if that is what you wish to do. But should you pass it today, not following the statutes of the State of Illinois, you will have passed а supplemental appropriation that's illegal and you won't be able to So, we're simply asking that you appropriate the money. follow the law. If this part of the...if the Balanced Budget Act required Second Reading, it would say so just as the Fiscal Note Act does. So, I think this is a major stretch by the Parliamentarian and yourself, Mr. Speaker. And it seems to me that you're going way beyond what need to do, considering you can do this tomorrow. don't you simply have the document filed, as the statute One moment, please. Have we determined whether the Note has or has not been filed? We haven't asked that question or have...yes. Can we ask the Clerk, Sir?"

Speaker Churchill: "Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk McLennand: "No Note has been filed on this Bill."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Mr. Speaker, again I urge the Chair to follow the law. The law of the State of Illinois is clear. What you're doing here is a major stretch of that law, particularly since...particularly since, the Fiscal Note Act talks about Second Reading, talks about the ability to make a Motion to hold it inapplicable. This Act does not do either of those things. It talks about supplemental appropriations, as amended, so you can't do it on Second Reading because it's as amended and in addition, does not allow for a Motion to hold it inapplicable. Accordingly, Sir, you not only would be stretching the law, you will be doing an illegal act and you'll be passing the Supplemental Appropriation illegally,

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

and no statement by yourself or the Parliamentarian or Mr. Daniels can change that. And if you want to proceed to pass an illegal supplemental budget, then you go right ahead and do that. But we want it very clear on the record that this an illegal act. This document must be filed. The statute lays out exactly what must be in this document and do not require this document to be filed is an illegal act. If the Chair persists in overruling my request, then we would move to overrule the Chair and we would ask for a Roll Call Vote. But before we do that, I would urge the Chair to reconsider the possibility that you may be illegally passing a supplemental budget. And by the way, Mr. Speaker, if...well, we'll just hold that off. So, I would ask...I would urge you to reconsider, Sir."

- Speaker Churchill: "Representative Lang, you're a very good lawyer, I have a very good lawyer as our Parliamentarian, it is his belief that, as the Chair stated, that is the Chair's ruling. The question then for you would be whether you wish to overrule the Chair. Is that your Motion, Sir? Representative Lang."
- Lang: "I wish to rule...I wish to move to overrule the Chair. I would ask for a Roll Call Vote and would ask for a verification should your ruling be sustained."
- Speaker Churchill: "The question is, 'Shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained?' All those in favor will vote 'aye'; all opposed will vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. The Chair will announce the numbers and then we'll go to Representative Lang for the verification, if he...Representative Lang, before I make the announcement of the numbers, do you have some other point you wish to raise?"

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

- Lang: "Yes, only to point out that Representative Stephens, who I thought had an excused absence, has voted 'aye' on this Bill. Has he registered with the Clerk, Sir?"
- Speaker Churchill: "Yes, he has registered and he's present."
 Lang: "Thank you."
- Speaker Churchill: "On this Motion, there are 64 voting 'aye', 52 voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. Representative Lang, do you persist in your request for a verification?"

 Lang: "Sure."
- Speaker Churchill: "There is a request for a verification. For what reason does Representative Cowlishaw rise?"
- Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would request a leave for a verification."
- Speaker Churchill: "Representative Lang, Representative Cowlishaw has requested leave."
- Lang: "Well, frankly, Mr. Speaker, on a Bill of this importance and on an issue where we believe the Chair has acted not only in error but illegally, we're not about to give any Members of the Majority Party leave at this time."
- Speaker Churchill: "Mr. Clerk, please read the affirmative."
- Clerk McLennand: "Those Representatives voting in the affirmative: Representatives Ackerman. Balthis. Biggert. Biggins. Black. Bost. Brady. Churchill. Ciarlo. Clayton. Cowlishaw. Cross. Deuchler, Durkin. Hanrahan. Hassert. Hoeft. Hughes. Johnson, Tim. Johnson. Jones, John. Klingler. Krause. Kubik. Lachner. Lawfer. Leitch. Lindner. Lyons. McAuliffe. Meyer. Mitchell. Moffitt. Moore, Andrea. Mulligan. Murphy, Maureen. Noland. Myers. O'Connor. Pankau. Parke. Pedersen. Persico. Poe. Roskam. Rutherford. Ryder. Salvi. Saviano. Skinner. Spangler. Stephens. Tenhouse. Turner, John. Wait. Weaver. Wennlund. Winkel. Winters.

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

Wirsing. Wojcik. Zabrocki. Zickus. And Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Representative Kubik."

- Speaker Churchill: "Is Representative Kubik in the Chamber?

 Representative Kubik is behind Representative Ryder.

 Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Well, let's see who else voted for this illegal act.

 Representative Bost? All right."
- Speaker Churchill: "Representative Bost is in his chair."
- Lang: "He is in his chair and voted for an illegal act.

 Representative Lyons? Oh, Representative Lyons, who voted

 for an illegal act, is in her chair. Representative

 Ciarlo?"
- Speaker Churchill: "Representative Lang, this is a verification.

 Please, if you would withhold the editorial comment; it would be appreciated. Who else?"
- Lang: "Oh sure. We'll just assume that all of these folks voted for an illegal act and we'll go from there."
- Speaker Churchill: "Well, Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Representative Ciarlo."
- Speaker Churchill: "Representative Ciarlo's in her chair. This is dilatory, Representative Lang, you know that these people are there, you can see them."
- Lang: "Well, no, actually I can't, Sir. There's people milling around. There's a chair in front of Representative Ciarlo.

 I did not see her until she raised her hand. So, I will proceed. Thank you very much. Representative Mitchell. I see Representative Mitchell. Representative Meyer. I see him, his back was to me, Sir. See this isn't dilatory, I couldn't see him. Representative John Jones."
- Speaker Churchill: "Representative Jones is waving at you."
- Lang: "Thank you, I see him, he was hiding behind those staffy

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

people over there. Chief Winkel."

Speaker Churchill: "The chief is in his seat as he always is."

Lang: "The chief is in his chair. Representative Zabrocki. Oh, standing. I didn't expect him to be standing."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Lang, this is dilatory. Do you have anything further? Were...these people are standing right out in front of you, there was nobody in front of Representative Winkel, there's nobody standing in front of Representative Zabrocki."

Lang: "Sir, as a matter of fact, Representative Wojcik and Representative Burke were blocking my view of Mr. Winkel and I could not see him."

Speaker Churchill: "For shame, Representative Burke."

Lang: "So, Representative Maureen Murphy. Oh, hi. If you were in your seat, I would know where you were."

Speaker Churchill: "She's standing right in front of you,

Representative Lang."

Lang: "Representative Poe."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Poe is in his chair."

Lang: "Where? I don't see him."

Speaker Churchill: "In his chair."

Lang: "Oh, there he is. You see he's hiding his face with that hand, Sir. I can't see him. Hi, Moe. How are you? Nice to see you."

Speaker Churchill: "Do you have anything further, Representative Lang?"

Lang: "Representative Winters."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Winters is standing in front of his chair."

Lang: "But see that microphone was hiding his face and I just couldn't see him. Is Representative Stephens now here, Sir?"

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Stephens is here. It is my understanding that he is not feeling well. I'll have him come visit you."

Lang: "No. He'll catch what I have if he comes over here.

Nothing further, Sir, regarding this illegal act."

Speaker Churchill: "Sixty four voting 'aye', 52 voting 'no', and the Chair is sustained. Representative Ryder, to close."

Ryder: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It may come as some surprise to those who are on the Democratic side to hear a Republican suggest that there are times that you almost miss being in a minority. Today's probably one of those times because when you're in the minority, you don't have to worry about the state's business. You can criticize, you can cajole, you can make fun of, you can pick out the most picayune item in a supplemental and say, 'Well, I would have voted for it but it had \$3.98 and I decided not to.' As a result, today we heard Member after Member stand up and say, 'Why didn't you do more to pay old debts?' then another one stood up and said, 'Well, why did you pay more old debts when you should have been paying for children? Why didn't you have more money for the aging? Why didn't you have more money for other items within that entire...for other items within that entire supplemental?' Most people who don't serve on the appropriation process think that your job is easy, you get to say yes, you get to The tough part of appropriations add things. The tough part is not adding; the tough part is making priorities and decisions. I'm certain that if each one of us, if each one of us had the opportunity to draft a supplemental, we would have done it differently, but we don't have that opportunity today. We have to draft something that a majority will agree to, that a

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

will agree to, and that is within fiscal limits. One of the legislative leaders on the other side got up and talked about bouncing checks. I'm certain that, that Representative has never had that experience because I believe him to be a honorable and efficient man who doesn't do that sort of thing. But guess what? The state doesn't bounce checks either. The state has a very complicated system by which we simply don't, we simply don't...excuse me?"

- Speaker Churchill: "For what reason does the Gentleman from Cook,

 Representative Lang, interrupt Representative Ryder's

 closing remarks?"
- Lang: "Thank you. I really hate to do that to a colleague and I apologize, Representative Ryder. But the Rule 7-3 (e) would require that the clock be on, on his closing and we would ask that the clock be turned on."
- Speaker Churchill: "We'll be happy to. In fact, if I look up there it says 3:01, so the clock is on. Representative Ryder, continue your closing, please. Representative Lang."
- Lang: "All right then...then, if that's what you want to do, then
 I would ask that the timer be turned on. He has only five
 minutes to close debate, under your rules, Sir, which we
 voted against. So, we would demand that you adhere to your
 rules on the closing of this particular Bill. And please
 note that Mr. Ryder has already spoken about three minutes,
 Sir."
- Speaker Churchill: "Unfortunately, the button says five minutes.

 It doesn't say two and half minutes or three and a half minutes, so it's tough to break that time up. But pursuant to the request from the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang, we will return to Representative Ryder's closing and

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

we will start the five minute clock. Representative Ryder, the clock is on and the timer is, too."

Ryder: "So, I quess it's easy to criticize. I guess it's easy to suggest that checks will bounce. Checks don't bounce. We don't issue the checks unless the money is there. То suggest otherwise, is either to indicate that you have a lack of knowledge of the fiscal operations of the State of Illinois and the Gentleman that suggested that a person in my opinion who has far too much credibility to fall into that category or a person who is suggesting for political purposes only, that they are not going to vote in favor of this Bill. Well, don't vote in favor of it, if you don't want to spend money to help the very children foster parents, the Department of Aging, the additional 800 clients, the people that were thrown out of their homes by the flood and have been waiting for almost two years to receive money to start their life again. you take that attitude, don't vote for the Bill, if you don't want to pay any of those back unpaid bills that complain so loudly and bitterly about. Don't cry crocodile tears because you believe that we ought to do more in one area and more in another area. Because the fact of matter is, that we don't spend money that isn't in the bank. And the fact of the matter is, that the majority to be responsible on this situation. I would sincerely like to have a lot of votes from both sides of the aisle that suggest, we need to take care of those people that are providing services for the State of Illinois. I would particularly like to have votes from both sides of the aisle, of those people that receive their paycheck from the State of Illinois and spend that money. Because to suggest a 'no' on this vote and say, 'I didn't vote in favor of a

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

pay increase', neither did I. To say, 'Oh no, I'm not going to be voting in favor of a pay increase', neither did we. But to then take the check, well, I hope you live with hope you explain it. It's not a pay...no one on this side's voting for a pay increase. We're simply voting to try to fund the State of Illinois as best we can: exactly what you criticize us for during the hour and forty minutes that we've had this conversation. result, we're going to proceed with this, just like we're going to try to proceed with the budget, just like we're going to try to do what it is that all of us were elected to do. And as a result, you can make your cat calls, you can go right ahead, if that makes you feel better, if that makes you feel like you're participating in the process. you may do that. It doesn't bother us. We're going to proceed with the business of the state and we're going to do the very best that we can. Is it subject to criticism? Sure. Do you do a good job of criticizing? we're going to proceed with the business of this state. We're going to do our very best to try to solve those problems within the ability that we have. I invite you to join. I invite you to participate, just like I've invited you to participate today. But to suggest otherwise, I guess that's the easy way out for those who are in position to take that. And on one final note let me suggest, that there are those who would indicate appropriation process is... is a kin to the dismal science of economics. I want to thank those people that stand the back, that work the long hours. The staff that's helpful; the ones that give us our answers; the ones that gives us our questions; the ones who are working long and hard to try to make sense out of all that we do. They work

52nd Legislative Day

- May 3, 1995
- hard. And on behalf of myself and I hope a lot of others, we thank them for that. And on that note, Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of Senate Bill 923."
- Speaker Churchill: "Mr. Clerk, has the Sponsor provided the note?"
- Clerk McLennand: "A Balanced Budget Note has been filed by the Sponsor."
- Speaker Churchill: "So the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 923 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. This is final action. Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Well, thank you. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. May
 I state it?"
- Speaker Churchill: "I'm sorry, Representative Lang, I didn't hear
 you."
- Lang: "Parliamentary inquiry. May I state it, Sir?"
- Speaker Churchill: "Yes. Please state it."
- Lang: "Thank you. Twenty-five..."
- Speaker Churchill: "Let me take the record and then we'll come back to that."
- Lang: "Yeah, but..."
- Speaker Churchill: "Yes. Representative Lang, we'll be right back to you. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Twenty five ILCS 80, in Section 15 has certain provisions regarding what needs to be done with the Balanced Budget Notes for them to be properly filed. I want to read the appropriate Sections of this and then ask if this Section of the Act has been complied with, Sir. It says, 'Balanced Budget Note shall be filed with the Clerk of the House for Supplemental Appropriation

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

Bills.' Apparently, that's been done. And with the Secretary of the Senate for Supplemental Appropriation I don't know if that's been done. The respective office shall apply a time stamp to each Balanced Budget receives, I don't know if that's been done. the time that the Balanced Budget Note was filed, I don't that's been done. A copy of the Balanced Budget Note clearly showing the date and time the Note was shall be provided by the Clerk of the House or the Secretary of the Senate, as the case may be. То the presiding officer, I don't know if that's been done, and to the Minority Leader of the respective chamber, and I'm certain that has not been done. The Chair and Minority Spokesman of the Appropriation Committee to which the Supplemental Appropriation Bill is assigned and we that has not been done. The Sponsor of Supplemental Appropriations Bill and I don't know if that's been done. And of different of the Sponsor of Supplemental Appropriation Bill, the Sponsor the Amendment, and I don't know if that's been done. Section 20, note contents, Balanced Budget Note shall be factual in nature, concise and shall include a brief explanation of the nature of the measure and a reliable estimate of the measures anticipated effect on the state budget for Maybe that's been done, I don't know. Note shall include both the immediate affect and, determinable or reasonably foreseeable, the long range affect of the measure, I would bet that has not been done. A brief summary or worksheet of computations used in arriving at figures shall be included, I would bet anything that has not been done. Each Balanced Budget Note shall include a discussion of the proposed reduction in other

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

appropriations or increases in state revenue that would allow the measure to be adopted without adversely affecting the state budget for that fiscal year. I would bet a lot of money that has not been done. So, inquiry of the Clerk. Has all this been done?"

- Speaker Churchill: "Mr. Clerk. Can you answer that?"
- Clerk McLennand: "A Budget Impact Note was filed with the Clerk at 3:00 on the 3rd. It is stamped. Copies have been placed both in the Republican, Democrat baskets and copies are being sent both to the Speaker, the Minority Leader and the Chairmen of both...both Chairmen of the Appropriation Committees."
- Speaker Churchill: "Furthermore, it was the Chair's ruling, which you sought to overturn and you were unsuccessful, that the request was untimely made. So, this is a moot point. On this question, there are 64 voting 'aye', 52 voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. And this Bill, having receiving a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Lang. Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I guess you didn't hear the first

 10 or 12 yells for Speaker. Let me...let me ask you this,
 Sir..."
- Speaker Churchill: "Representative Lang. Representative Lang, the Chair had made a ruling. You sought to overturn the ruling of the Chair. You were not successful in that. You were revisiting that same grounds and we were beyond that point. I told you that the point was moot and we went on to...to make the call on the Bill. Yes, Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Mr. Speaker, if I was so wrong and if this side of the aisle was so wrong on this issue, what was the big hurry about filing this superfluous Note? Why did we do this? So

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

- if...and if the Note is filed, it must be filed in accordance with the law. So, the Clerk has indicated that copies will be filed and given to the appropriate people. What about all these other things? What about Note Contents, 80/20? What about that? Has the Clerk reported, as I requested, as to what's in this Note?"
- Speaker Churchill: "Representative Lang, you're original request on this issue was untimely. The Chair ruled. You're going over ground that you covered previously. You sought to overrule the Chair. That was not successful and we're at the point where the Bill is done. Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Well, then why in the heck did you file the Note? Why waste the taxpayers money having somebody prepare a note that the...that Mr. Speaker has determined it's superfluous in the first place? What's the purpose of filing an irrelevant document, Sir?"
- Speaker Churchill: "Representative Lang, you've heard the ruling of the Chair. The Bill is over. Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Well, you don't intend to answer this question? Then I'll tell you what. Inquiry of the Clerk. May I proceed, Sir?"
- Speaker Churchill: "The Chair has already called this Bill. This
 Bill is passed. We are going on to other business.

 Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Am I not entitled to make an inquiry of the Clerk? You passed this Bill. It's off the board. There will be no verification. You will not change your ruling but I'm entitled to ask a question of the Clerk, Sir."
- Speaker Churchill: "You are entitled to walk up to the well and ask the Clerk a question, too. So..."
- Lang: "I'm entitled to ask this question on the record, because the statutes of the State of Illinois are more important than your illegal ruling, Sir. And I'm entitled to ask

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

whether a document..."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Lang. Representative Lang. Representative Lang. You've already asked that question. Representative Lang, you've already asked that question voluminously. And your original question was untimely. You sought to overrule the Chair, you were not sustained in that. And you asked the subsequent questions, the Clerk answered and the Bill is over. Representative Lang, one more comment and then we'll move on. Yes, Representative Lang."

Lang: "Well, Sir, you should know by now that whether my microphone's on or off I will make my comments. I'm entitled to ask a question of the Clerk. He answered my question regarding AD/15 and I think it was a wonderful answer, Sir. But he did not answer my questions regarding 80/20, the contents of the Note. I'm looking over here at a copy of the Note, which is about three lines long, and as I read to you previously, Sir, the Note Content. Balanced budget note shall be factual in nature..."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "...concise and shall include a brief explanation of the nature and the measure..."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "...and reliable estimate..."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "...of the measurement..."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Lang, you read that previously. We answered that. Representative Lang, we have answered that. You have a copy of that. If you feel that, that is inaccurate, you have your rights. But at this point, we are done debating this issue. We're going to move on. I...well...the Chair is done. Supplemental

52nd Legislative Day

- May 3, 1995
- Calendar #1. Supplemental Calendar announcements."
- Clerk McLennand: "Supplemental Calendar #2 is being distributed."
- Speaker Churchill: "On Supplemental Calendar #1, will the Clerk please read House Resolution 43."
- Clerk McLennand: "House Resolution #43, offered by Representatives Churchill and Ryder. Pursuant to Rule 3-7, the legislative measures listed in this Resolution are recommitted to the Rules Committee. Rules recommends, 'be adopt'."
- Speaker Churchill: "Representative Ryder on House Resolution #43."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The purpose of this Resolution is to recommit to Rules Committee those Bills that remain on the Calendar on Third Reading after the deadline of last week. I would move the adoption of the Resolution."
- Churchill: "Any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Clinton, Representative Granberg."
- Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?"
- Speaker Churchill: "He indicates that he will. Please proceed."
- Granberg: "Representative Ryder, I thought we had done this last
 week on three separate occasions. That we had put
 Ru...Bills back into Rules Committee. Was that not the
 case?"
- Speaker Churchill: "Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Representative Granberg, I apologize for the...my inability to hear you. If you would kindly restate your question, I'll do my best to answer it."
- Speaker Churchill: "Representative Granberg."
- Granberg: "Thank...Thank you, Representative. It was my understanding that last week, we had two or three separate resolutions that recommitted approximately 250 House Bills back to Rules Committee. So, previously, we have taken off

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

about 300 Bills off the Calendar, just this past week and put them in Rules Committee. Is that correct?"

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, I do not know the exact count. There were at least two occasions in my memory in which Members had asked to have their Bills committed to Rules for many reasons, I assume. And that did take place. This is the remainder of the Bills that were on Third Reading."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "So, this would apply to the remainder of the Bills on the Calendar, Sir. How many Bills are currently on the Calendar? I don't know offhand."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, I'm sorry, I did not spend my time to count the number of Bills. It is the remainder of the Bills, which under our rules, go back to the Rules Committee and that's the purpose of the resolution, to comply."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "I assume, Representative, that...I want to make sure all the Members have been contacted by your leadership. So, this is at the request of every individual Member who is currently sponsoring a Bill on the Calendar, that he or she would like to have that Bill recommitted. Because, there's been a glowing problem with Members rights in this Body lately and they seemed to have been trampled upon. So, I assume this is at the request of each individual Member, so they can control their legislation. Is that correct?"

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, allow me to draw a distinction, if I may.

The resolutions that were adopted last week were at the request of the Members who were the Sponsors of those

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

Bills, that was to commit to rules prior to a deadline. And in each and every case, those Bills that were committed back to rules, were at the request of the Sponsors. That is not the case with the resolution before you, Sir. This is to commit all Bills that were on Third Reading, which under our rules, are unable to be considered at this point, which under our rules, go back to the Rules Committee. The purpose of the resolution is to follow our rules, Sir."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Two points, Representative. First of all, so I assume all the Bills last week were put back in Rules Committee at the request of the individual Member. So, they do not want to pursue their legislation, whether that be Representative Bost or Representative Poe or whomever. And secondly, would the... you said the rules provide that these Bills go back to Rules Committee. It's my understanding that does not occur until the last...till the 31st day after the Session has adjourned. So, this does not apply, in fact, this avoids your rules. So once again, it seems like you're not taking your rules into serious consideration. You're avoiding your own rules, because they would go back to Rules Committee after the adjournment of Session. Is that...is my understanding correct on this?"

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Representative.

Allow me to clarify my remarks, if I may. You are correct
when you state that they automatically go back in 31 days.
You and I agree on that, Sir. However, now that the Bills
are on the Calendar, in their present status, in order for
these Bills to move at any time in the remainder of the
Session, it takes action by the Rules Committee. So, the

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

purpose of this resolution is to put all of those Bills, so that any or none can be considered by the Rules Committee for any further action at the request of the Members."

Speaker Churchill: "Further discussion, the Lady from Cook, Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I rise in opposition to the Motion to adopt House Resolution 43. Ιt is fair to say that individual Members asked the Rules Committee to return particular measures to the Rules Committee earlier Session. As far as I know, nobody talks to the Democratic Sponsors of Bills that are among the Bills that are the subject of House Resolution 43. And I would suggest that if you wanted to draft the rules, so that Bills return to the Rules Committee after a Third Reading deadline, you should have drafted the rules that way. There is absolutely no point in taking up the valuable time of the Members of this chamber, in order to deal with 'hokie' resolutions like this one. Now, you know and I know that Leadership of this Chamber could change its mind between and tomorrow and decide to extend the Third Reading deadline. They've already decided to change the deadline for consideration in this Chamber of Senate Bills, So, there's nothing sacrosanct about the deadlines that we believe we live under. And in fact, of course, the Leadership of this Chamber can make that determination without any help, any discussion, any debate from us. I would think our wiser course, given that perhaps the deadline will one day be exp...extended, given the Democratic Members of this Chamber did not ask for their Bills to be returned to the death bed that is the Rules Committee. I would say, let's pay attention to the rules you drafted. If you don't like them, change them and let

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

us reject House Resolution 43."

Speaker Churchill: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Macoupin, Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Churchill: "He indicates he will, please proceed."

Hannig: "Did you indicate...did you indicate, Representative,
that all the Bills that were on...other than Appropriation
Bills on Second and Third Reading are covered by this
Resolution?"

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, it was my intention to include on this Resolution, all of the Bills that were on Second and Third for which the deadline applied. Obviously, Appropriations would not include that and we attempt to deal with those today and tomorrow, if that's possible. If I missed one, Representative, I truly apologize."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "I'm not certain, but do you know if 2481, for example, which is a Substantive Bill is on that list? It's the last Bill on Second Reading, listed on our Calendar, on page 6."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative Hannig, I would draw your attention to the front page of the Resolution, House Resolution 43...Do you have it, Sir? It's been distributed for quite some time. Perhaps, some of the staff that so ably assisted you during the Appropriations, might be able to provide it. I would direct your attention, Sir, to the first page of that and what has been identified by the left hand line, #19, the second column to the right, includes House Bill 2441."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative

Hannig...excuse...Representative Ryder, I'm sorry."

Ryder: "I apologize, Representative, that same line in the third

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

column is 2481, which I'm told is the Bill about which you made specific reference. Is that correct?"

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes, Representative. I honestly did not have the copy in front of me and I just wanted to be sure that all the Bills on Second and Third Reading, other than the Appropriation Bills, were indeed covered. And I had an interest...I just picked that Bill and I appreciate your bringing that to my attention. So, you're...you are covering all the Bills on the Calendar, is what you're saying?"

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you and, Representative, if you were in some way inferring that perhaps, the Bill that you brought my attention to yesterday, when we attempted to move from Second to Third on Appropriation, those Bills have been included in this Resolution."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Thank you for that clarification, Representative Ryder." Speaker Churchill: "Lady from Cook, Representative Wojcik."

Wojcik: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Churchill: "The Lady moves the previous question. All those in favor of having the previous question moved, will signify by saying 'aye'; any opposed will say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the previous question is moved. Representative Ryder to close. Representative Ryder moves for the adoption of House Resolution 43. All those in favor will vote 'aye', any opposed will vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 62 'ayes', 52 'noes' and the Motion is adopted.

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

Supplemental Calendar #2. Ladies and Gentlemen, the next item of business is Supplemental Calendar #2, dealing with Appropriation Vehicle Bills. It is the intention of the Chair to entertain a Motion from Representative Ryder to handle all Bills on one vote, similar to the Agreed Bill Process. Any Member wishing to caste a specific vote on one Bill, may record that vote on the ballots distributed by the Clerk. We will allow 30 minutes for completion of the individual ballots, after which the results of voting on each Bill will be tabulated, announced and the record taken prior to adjournment. Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the Appropriation Process, there's certain agreements that were made. the Appropriation Process, the chairs of the committee agreed with the spokespersons of the committees to allow two Vehicle Bills from the Majority and one vehicle from the Minority to be allowed out of committee. And with one exception, that was done. Yesterday and even early today, I notified my counterpart Representative Hannig, of an offer to move five Republican vehicles and three Democratic vehicles in this single Roll Call. I now extend that courtesy and that Motion at this time, in order to move these eight Bills, three Democratic and five Republican, to the Senate. Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Churchill: "The Chair recognizes...The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Macoupin, Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, and I appreciate that Representative Ryder did have the courtesy to talk to me about this process, but I think I clearly indicated to him that we were not interested in being a part of this process, that we did not intend to

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

move our Vehicle Bills to the Senate. And I really object to the idea that this list should be out on our desks at this point, indicating to the Members, perhaps in our caucus, that was some kind of agreement or that there was some kind of Agreed Bill Process going here, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would ask that we have a Roll Call Vote on each of these Bills separately, and I would ask that we not...and that we divide the question. And that our Members have an opportunity to withdraw our Bills from the record if we so choose, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Hannig had indicated to me that it was his position and the position his Party, not to participate in an Agreed Bill I wanted to make it clear that that offer was Process. made to him. He made that clear. The reason that the items are being circulated at this point is in preparation for that. Since the Gentleman has indicated that on his part and on behalf of his Party, that they do not wish to participate in a normal or customary Agreed Bill List, the items are there to be discussed, that I will acknowledge what the Gentleman said, and I will inform the Chair that I am withdrawing any suggestion that an Agreed Bill Process would work. The papers were on the desk. It was obvious how we intended to proceed, but as a result of the Gen...Gentleman's suggestion, then I withdraw my Motion, Sir."

Speaker Churchill: "Motion is withdrawn. It would be the opinion of the Chair that we would proceed to each of these Bills individually. We will now proceed to the order of House Bills, Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read House Bill 1016."

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

- Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 1016, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Board of Higher Education. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Churchill: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Coles, Representative Weaver."
- Weaver: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1016 is a Vehicle Bill that deals essentially with the Board of Higher Education, for its FY'96 ordinary and contingence expense. We currently have no concrete plans as to what we intend to do with this, just to have a Vehicle our there for possible use later on, and I ask for its passage."
- Speaker Churchill: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Macoupin, Representative Hannig."
- Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I rise in opposition to this proposal. Every item that Governor wishes to be funded is found somewhere in the budget already. Whether that's in a House Bill or whether that's in a Senate Bill, all those proposals for every agency, for every part of state government is already included in the state budget, somewhere. And our job is to try to look at those budgets, to change those budgets if we feel it's appropriate, but ultimately to pass a budget and put it on the Governor's desk. Now, I see no need for us to pass these Vehicle Bills when we have the real Bills here in the House of Representatives and over in the Senate. So, I would suggest that these are not necessary. That we should all vote 'no', and that we should get to the business of actually passing the real Bills that are before us."

Speaker Churchill: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook,

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Churchill: "He indicates he will, please proceed."

Lang: "Representative, how much are you appropriating to the Board of Higher Education in this Bill?"

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Weaver."

Weaver: "Because this is a Vehicle Bill, we only app...appropriate one dollar."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Is it your view that one dollar will cover the ordinary contingent expenses of the Board of Higher Education for the next fiscal year?"

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Weaver."

Weaver: "Well, I...I don't know that we really need to get into a text book session to explain to you what Vehicle Bill is.

But a vehicle is something that...essentially contains nothing except the subject...general subject matter and so, we intend to use it for something before. Previous speaker indicated that as part of negotiations in the past, I've been involved in budgeteer sessions for years in the past, and he knows as well as you know, that a lot of the negotiation will continue from this point forward and we need something in which to place those negotiated elements, once we agree to what the final budget is going to look like."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "So there's nothing in this Bill, and even though you've indicated many times, your side of the aisle, that you're going to do things differently than were done in the past, you insist on doing that. That's fine. Let me...let me ask you this. What did the Governor recommend in his budget for the Board of Higher Education?"

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

- Speaker Churchill: "Representative Weaver."
- Weaver: "Obviously, I can't speak for the Governor and you'll have to ask him, I quess."
- Speaker Churchill: "Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Sir, this is your budget. You don't know what the Governor recommended on his budget book for the Board of Higher Education?"
- Speaker Churchill: "Representative Lang. You're done?

 Representative Weaver."
- Weaver: "Again, this is a Vehicle Bill. This is where...may be where we place the final negotiations that you...your side of the aisle, our side of the aisle, and both sides in the Senate, and the Governor's staff will sit down and try to work out."
- Speaker Churchill: "Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Well, let me...let me just say that we'll stand in opposition to all these Vehicle Bills. If you want even call them Vehicle Bills, it seems to me that you're telling a lot of people in this state that you don't really have any answers here, just a lot of questions."
- Speaker Churchill: "Further discussion, the Lady from Cook,
 Representative Schakowsky. Representative Schakowsky,
 you're on. Further discussion, the Gentleman...there being
 no further discussion, Representative Weaver to close."
- Weaver: "As all of us who are involved in the appropriation's process understand, the next coming weeks of Session will be heavily involved with what...deciding what the final budget of the State of Illinois looks like and while we may agree or disagree with current Bills that are floating around out there, we felt it essential to have a Vehicle available in various areas to encompass those agreements that we finally reach between the House, the Senate, and

- 52nd Legislative Day May 3, 1995
 the Governor's Office. And I ask for a favorable passage
 of this Bill."
- Speaker Churchill: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1016 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 64 'ayes', 52 'no', and none voting 'present', and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, please read House Bill 1018."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1018, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the State Board of Education, Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Churchill: "Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Coles, Representative Weaver."
- Weaver: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is similar to the previous Bill, with the exception that this appropriates one dollar to the State Board of Education and essentially is our Vehicle to deal with those issues upon agreement. And I ask for its passage."
- Speaker Churchill: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Macoupin, Representative Hanniq."
- Hannig: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Will the Gentleman yield?"
- Speaker Churchill: "He indicates he will, please proceed."
- Hannig: "Did you say that we're proposing some state aid money in this Bill, Representative? That's what it says on the board, something about...about State Board of Education?"
- Speaker Churchill: "Representative Weaver."
- Weaver: "This is a Vehicle Bill, dealing with the subject matter

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

of the State Board of Education."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Hannig."

- Hannig: "Well, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would also oppose this Bill. I'm not sure that I want to be on record as suggesting that we should spend one dollar or two dollars for education this year or that we should not fund any of the number of things that education really needs to have funded this year. There really is an education Bill in the House for us to debate, but we don't... we don't need to do 1018. And I'd suggest that all the Members vote 'no' on this proposal."
- Speaker Churchill: "Representative Weaver now moves for the passage of House Bill 1018. The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1018 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 64 voting 'aye', 52 voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. This Bill having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, please read House Bill 803."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 803, a Bill for an Act making appropriations, Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Churchill: "Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Adams,

 Representative Tenhouse."
- Tenhouse:: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 803 is a Vehicle Bill that's coming out of the Public Safety Infrastructure Appropriations Committee. It simply appropriates one dollar, GRF, the Department of State Police, to study the effectiveness of the DARE Program. I ask for its passage."
- Speaker Churchill: "Is there any discussion? The Chair

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

recognizes the Gentleman from Macoupin, Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Rep...Would the Representative yield for a question?"

Speaker Churchill: "He indicates he will, please proceed."

Hannig: "Did you say that there was money in this Bill, Representative, for the DARE Program?"

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Tenhouse."

Tenhouse: "We already have money as far as the Dare Program, and other lines, but what we're talking about here is that it appropriates one dollar's GRF to the Department of State Police to study the effectiveness of the DARE Program."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Nothing further. So again, Rep...Members of the House, Ladies and Gentlemen and Members of the House, I would oppose this proposal that decides to suggest that we should spend all of one dollar to study the DARE Program. There are appropriation Bills in the House that we should consider. There are appropriation Bills in the Senate that we should consider, that deal with the real issues of the budget. These Vehicle Bills are not necessary and I certainly would oppose them."

Speaker Churchill: "Further discussion, the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I simply rise to speak in favor of the Bill. The Gentleman is trying to put a very unique spin on every Bill and I can only imagine what the Gentleman has in mind, in trying to spin this Appropriation Vehicle Bill, that we're only appropriating one dollar for the DARE Program. Well, let me put a reverse spin on it. I'm going to vote to spend one dollar for the DARE Program. He's going to vote to spend nothing for the DARE Program. This whole idea of spend control is

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

totally out of control. I suggest we get on with the business of the House."

Speaker Churchill: "Further discussion? The Lady from Cook, Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. I rise in opposition to passage of this Bill. Spend however you The fact is, that we didn't get sent here to spend our energies on Vehicle Bills, when it's clear that could craft a budget for the coming fiscal year of the state. The Appropriation Committees are all expected. They're all scheduled to meet this week. I think it shows a lack of imagination and a lack of ability. leadership, that we are spending our time on Wednesday afternoon, passing Bills that do nothing in respect to the state budget. It may be that after we've done the budget, after we've passed the Bills out of committee and out of this House in a fashion in which we think they make sense, maybe it's sensible to pass one or two other Bills in case things get clogged up in the Senate. I've known that to Many of the Members who've been in this chamber before have known that to happen. But for us to rush for our first appropriation, our first budget issue for fiscal 1996, to sit here wasting our time, our energy, and our chatter on Shell Bills seems to me, to show that we don't the kind οf Leadership in this House of Representatives that we ought. And I think those of you, particularly the freshmen among you, ought to think pretty hard and pretty carefully about whether you want your 'yes' vote to be on yet one more Vehicle Bill, as they were last Thursday night. If you want one more Vehicle Bill to show to your folks back home as the way you're spending your energy and their money as a Member of this institution.

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

If I were you, I'd be pretty careful. I'd vote 'no'."

Speaker Churchill: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Saltsman."

Saltsman: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Churchill: "He indicates he will, please proceed."

Saltsman: "Yes, Representative, we have discussed throughly, the diversion of road funds for the state police and it was rejected by both parties. Is this Vehicle Bill something to come in the back door and to use this money again for probably funding of a new class for state police or to revert those road funds back in? Can we make a commitment that there will be no road funds in this?"

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Tenhouse."

Tenhouse: "Representative, of course it's going to depend a lot on...as we work and hopefully will be able to have a bipartisan effort as we continue to work back and forth as far this appropriation process, much like we have worked in our committee. To say what is going to be in there specifically, you and I both know on the Vehicle Bill. what may finally be in the ultimate here when we get to the end, it's hard to project. Certainly, you know the Bill that we voted out regarding state police, that is not a Vehicle Bill, a Bill that's a Substantive Bill...not substantive but the Appropriation Bill that we voted out of committee last week, in fact, does not have any road fund diversion for state police."

Speaker: "Representative Saltsman."

Saltsman: "Yes, you and I have worked together very well in the past three years on these programs. But it seems after today, when we get these Bills out, they forget who you and I are. You know, the four or five big shots in this side of the building and the three or four over there, they're

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

going to call all the shots, but it's going to be very partisan this time, and all I'm trying to do is maybe get a commitment from the Floor because 118, probably 114 of us will be cut out of this after today. And we're just trying to find out what's going to happen because we're going to be brought back in here to vote on some appropriations the last day and 95% of us Members aren't even going to know what's in those appropriations. Because it don't look like there's going to be any negotiations and anything we can find out today would help us in the future. And the road projects, the funds haven't been brought here yet. were due on March the 5th. We don't have the Governor's provisions of what the projects are for 1996, and we should have had them all ready. So, at that, I'm just asking questions and I'll continue to cooperate. But you know yourself, you and I will be cooperating two days afterward, wondering what the hell happened to you and I."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Saltsman, that was not a question, it was a statement, okay. Further discussion?

The Gentleman from Jersey, Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I appreciate your patience today when we've talked about Appropriation Processes. I've taken the barbs and witticism of those who stood and talked about these issues. But I feel that I must stand and talk, when the Lady who spoke before the Gentleman from Peoria stands up and criticizes us for wasting our time when it was she and the Members of her Party who were so reluctant to move their Bills in an agreed process. We offered the opportunity. The yellow sheets of paper are on your desk. If you were concerned about wasting your time, why did you reject our offer of an agreed Bill list? Why did you reject our of...

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

our offer to cooperate? Don't tell us about wasting time. Don't complain to us. I suggest that we get on with the business of the House and we get moving so that those Appropriation Committees that are scheduled to meet right now, can get doing their business. They'll meet tonight. They'll meet tomorrow."

- Speaker Churchill: "Representative Tenhouse to close."
- Tenhouse: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would just simply ask for favorable Roll Call on House Bill 803."
- Speaker Churchill: "Question is, 'Shall House Bill 803 pass?" All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'nay'.

 The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 64 voting 'aye', 51 voting 'no' and none voting 'present', and this Bill having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, please read House Bill 809."
- Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 809, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Cental Management Services. The Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Churchill: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Biggins."
- Biggins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I urge an 'aye' vote on House Bill 809. It appropriates one dollar, General Revenue Funds for the expenses of the Department of Central Management Services to evaluate soy diesel fuel in state owned vehicles. Be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Churchill: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Macoupin, Representative

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Churchill: "He indicates he will, please proceed."

Hannig: "Yes, Representative. Does the Department of Central
Management Services, under this proposal we voted on last
week would oversee the Retired Teachers Program? Does this
have any money in this package for that?"

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Biggins."

Biggins: "It appropriates one dollar in the entire Bill, Sir."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. We object to the whole concept of sending these 'pigs in a poke' over to the Senate without any consideration. Whether their Democratic Bills or whether they're Republican Bills, we don't see the need and certainly don't believe it's the time to be sending these blank checks over to the Senate. We don't know how they're going to come back and what the Senate may have in mind for them. I'm not sure anybody knows what we have...what they have in mind for these Bills at this time. And until there's a specific need to have a Bill in the Senate, whether it's a Democratic Bill or whether it's a Republican Bill, we on this side of the aisle just think it's bad policy to be sending these blank checks over to the other Chamber and saying, 'Here, fill them in and send them back'. It's not good policy and we ought to vote this Bill down and all the Bills down."

Speaker Churchill: "If there be no further discussion, Representative Biggins to close."

Biggins: "I ur...I urge an 'aye' vote on behalf of all the farmers in the State of Illinois."

Speaker Churchill: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 809 pass?'

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those oppose vote 'nay'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 64 voting 'aye', 52 voting 'nay', and none voting 'present'. And this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, please read House Bill 1083."

- Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 1083, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department on Aging. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Churchill: "Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Mulligan."
- Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1083 appropriates one dollar from the General Revenue Fund to the Department on Aging for a study to evaluate the effectiveness of intermediate referral of all reports of abuse and neglect to appropriate local agencies for all further action. I ask for its passage."
- Speaker Churchill: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Macoupin, Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Lady yield?"

Speaker Churchill: "She indicates she will, please proceed."

Hannig: "Representative, why is it so necessary that we send this Shell Bill over to the Senate, today?"

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Representative, as you know, we're trying to end the Session early and we certainly want to hurry the budget discussions and get them into the mix. And I think it's important that we address the area of aging and get the Bill over there."

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "I understand though, Representative, that we have the Aging Budget on Third Reading here in the House. You're the Chairman of the committee that I think heard the Bill. Wouldn't that be adequate to deal with that agency? Why do we need a Vehicle Bill over in the Senate now?"

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Representative, I feel what we are following, what has happened in the past, and I assure you that I certainly feel that many of the things you have not done in previous years, particularly prior to when I was here, were all bad."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Well, just to the Bill. The Lady said we're following what's happened in the past. I think what's happened in the past is we've allowed the State of Illinois to get about 1.3 billion dollars in the hole. It seems to me that it's time that we change directions on how we deal with budgets around this House, that we change directions on the way that we deal with the Governor's budget. And one way to change directions is to simply not to pass all these Vehicle Bills, to send them over to the Senate Leadership and tell them to fill in the blanks and send them over here after they've gone home and tell us to pass them on the last day. We should stand for the House of Representatives having a right to hear these budgets, a right to determine the outcome of these budgets and not to give the Senate and the Senate Leadership sole responsibility and this plays right into their hands. I think we should all, as Members of the House of Representatives, object to sending these Vehicle Bills at this early date over to the Senate with no understanding or no concept of what they might put

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

and send it back and then go home and tell us to pass it or else. So, I'd urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Mulligan to close."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm sure Representative Hannig did not mean to infer that the Democrats have run up the debt, as he said in his statement, his last statement. Although, he did still have some concern that the debt has been run up in the past, and since they were in control of the House, I presume he was urging his own Party to get behind this. So, I would certainly recommend an 'aye' vote on this Bill, particularly since it deals with the elder citizens of our state."

Speaker Churchill: "Question is, 'Shall House Bill 1083 pass?'

All those in favor, vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 64 voting 'aye', 52 voting 'no' and none voting 'present', and this Bill having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, are there any announcements? Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Clerk has announcements about committees that will be meeting. Perhaps, you would like to just listen to this so you know where your committees will be meeting this afternoon and at what times. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk McLennand: "First, Rules Committee will meet immediately upon adjournment in Speaker's Conference Room; 2:00 committees will meet upon adjournment at 4:00. 4:00 committees will meet at 5:00 p.m. The Higher Education Committee for today is canceled. For Thursday, May 4th, Judiciary Criminal Law Committee will meet at 10:00 a.m.

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

Revenue Committee will meet at 9:00 a.m. Again, Rules Committee immediately upon adjournment. 2:00 committees will meet at 4:00. 4:00 committees will meet at 5:00. Higher Education Committee is canceled. Judiciary Criminal Law for tomorrow morning is 10:00 a.m. And Revenue Committee is 9:00 a.m."

- Speaker Churchill: "Representative Wojcik now moves that the House stand adjourned until Thursday, May 4, 1995, at the hour of 1:30 p.m. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And allowing for Perfunctory time for the Clerk, the House now stands adjourned until Thursday, May 4, 1995, at the hour of 1:30 p.m."
- Clerk McLennand: "Being no business for Perfunctory Session,

 Perfunctory Session is adjourned and the House will

 reconvene on Thursday, May 4th, at 1:30 p.m."
- Clerk McLennand: "Perfunctory Session is reconvened. Introduction, First Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 145, offered by Representative Cross. Bill for an Act that amends certain Acts in relation to limitations. Senate Bill 412, offered by Representative Wojcik. Bill for an Act for the conveyance of certain real property. Senate Bill 511, offered by Representative Cross. Bill for in relation to criminal law. Senate Bill 525, an Act offered by Representative O'Connor. Bill for an Act in relation to elder abuse. Senate Bill 559, offered by Representative Churchill. Bill for an Act in relation to motor vehicles. Senate Bill 596, offered by Representative Bill for an Act that amends the Mental Health Klingler. and Developmental Disabilities Confidentiality Act. Senate Bill 640, offered by Representative Poe. Bill for an Act that amends Probate Act of 1975. Senate Bill 643, offered

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

by Speaker Daniels. Bill for an Act concerning the Citizens Assembly. Senate Bill 681. offered bv Representative Lyons. Bill for an Act that amends a Retail Sales Act. Senate Bill 805, offered Representative Zickus. Bill for an Act that amends Illinois Educational Labor Relation Act. Senate Bill 825. offered by Representative Kubik. Bill for an Act amends Judicial Districts Act. Senate Bill 1115, offered by Representative Woolard. Bill for an Act that amends the School Code. Senate Bill 1123, offered by Representative Bill for an Act for creating the Metropolitan Balthis. Airport Authority. Senate Bill 1139. offered bv Representative McGuire. Bill for an Act concerning state agency leases of real property. Introduction, Reading, these Senate Bills. Continued introduction, First Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 441, offered by Representative Balthis. Bill for an Act in relation part time law enforcement officers, amending named Acts. Senate Bill 503, offered by Representative Churchill. Bill for an Act in relation to bonds. Senate Bill 523, offered Representative Schakowsky. Bill for an Act to amend Nursing Home Care Act. Senate Bill 539, offered by Representative Black. Bill for an Act concerning motor vehicles. Senate Bill 586, offered by Representative Balthis. Bill for an Act to amend the Local Government and Governmental Employees Torte Immunity Act. Senate Bill 653, offered by Representative McAuliffe. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code and to amend the State Mandates Act. Senate Bill 677, offered by Representative Meyer. Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. Senate Bill 739, offered by Representative Parke. Bill for an Act to amend

52nd Legislative Day

May 3, 1995

Personal Record Review Act. Senate Bill 791, offered by Representative Cross. Bill for an Act concerning Aids, amending named Acts. Senate Bill 801. offered Representative Zabrocki. Bill for an Act to amend the State Mandate's Act. Introduction, First Reading these Senate Bills. Introduction, First Reading, Senate Bill 1095, offered by Representative Erwin. Bill for an Act concerning radiation protection and installations. Senate Bill 1036, offered by Representative Salvi. Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code, 1961. Senate Bill 1206. offered by Representative Andrea Moore. Bill for an Act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act. And Senate Bill 1208, offered by Representative Ryder. Bill for an Act concerning business activity regulation. Introduction, First Reading, these Senate Bills. Now, there being no further business for the House Perfunctory Session, the House Perfunctory Session stands adjourned. And the House will reconvene on Thursday, May 4th, at the hour of p.m."

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 001

HOUSE ADJOURNED

PERFUNCTORY SESSION

REP CHURCHILL IN THE CHAIR

PERFUNCTORY SESSION ADJOURNED

MOTION TO OVERRULE CHAIR - REP LANG

MOTION FOR AGREED BILL LIST - REP RYDER

STATE OF ILLINOIS 89TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

96/07/29 11:20:22

42

51

70

86

86

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

MAY 03, 1995

HB-0803 THIRD READING	PAGE	76
HB-0809 THIRD READING	PAGE	81
HB-1016 THIRD READING		
	PAGE	72
HB-1018 THIRD READING	PAGE	75
HB-1083 THIRD READING	PAGE	83
SB-0145 FIRST READING	PAGE	86
SB-0401 FIRST READING	PAGE	5
SB-0412 FIRST READING	PAGE	86
SB-0441 FIRST READING	PAGE	87
SB-0503 FIRST READING		
	PAGE	87
SB-0511 FIRST READING	PAGE	86
SB-0523 FIRST READING	PAGE	87
SB-0525 FIRST READING	PAGE	86
SB-0539 FIRST READING	PAGE	87
SB-0559 FIRST REALING	PAGE	86
SB-0585 FIRST READING	PAGE	5
SB-0586 FIRST READING	PAGE	87
SB-0596 FIRST READING	PAGE	86
SB-0640 FIRST READING	PAGE	86
SB-0643 FIRST READING	PAGE	86
SB-0653 FIRST READING		
	PAGE	87
SB-0677 FIRST READING	PAGE	87
SB-0681 FIRST READING	PAGE	87
SB-0710 FIRST READING	PAGE	5
SB-0739 FIRST READING	PAGE	87
SB-0791 FIRST READING	PAGE	88
SB-0801 FIRST READING	PAGE	88
SB-0805 FIRST READING	PAGE	87
SB-0825 FIRST READING	PAGE	87
SB-0923 THIRD READING	- PAGE	
SB-1022 FIRST READING		6
	PAGE	5
SB-1025 FIRST READING	PAGE	5
SB-1036 FIRST READING	PAGE	88
SB-1095 FIRST READING	PAGE	88
SB-1115 FIRST READING	PAGE	87
SB-1122 FIRST READING	PAGE	5
SB-1123 FIRST READING	PAGE	87
SB-1139 FIRST READING	PAGE	87
SB-1194 FIRST READING	CASE PAGE 5	5
SB-1203 FIRST READING	PAGE	5
SB-1206 FIRST READING	PAGE	88
SB-1208 FIRST READING		88
HR-0043 ADOPTED	PAGE	
UR-0043 ADDELED	PAGE	69
HR-0043 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	64
SUBJECT MATTER		
MOVIGE TO ODDED ON THE TOTAL		
HOUSE TO ORDER - REP CHURCHILL	PAGE	1
PRAYER - REVEREND JANKOWSKI	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	2
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	2
COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE	
MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR	PAGE	3 4
RECESS	PAGE	5
HOUSE RECONVENES - REP CHURCHILL IN CHAIR	PAGE	5
COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE	5
REP BLACK IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	41
RED CHIRCHILL IN THE CHAIR	PACE	110